Library of The Theological Seminary
PRINCETON · NEW JERSEY

FROM THE LIBRARY OF THE
REVEREND JOHN ALEXANDER MACKAY
LITT.D., D.D., LL.D., L.H.D.

BX
1765
.852

J. Gresham Machen

1947

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JAN 22 1990
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

MANUAL

OF

ROMISH CONTROVERSY:

BEING

A COMPLETE REFUTATION

OF THE

CREED OF POPE PIUS IV.

BY

THE REV. R. P. BLAKENEY, D.D., LL.D.,
RECTOR AND RURAL DEAN OF BRIDLINGTON AND CANON OF YORK

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JAN 22 1990
THEOLOGICAL SEM

"MULTUM IN PARVO."

Twenty-seventh Thousand.

EDINBURGH: THE HOPE TRUST, 31 MORAY PLACE.
LONDON: THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION SOCIETY,
20 BERNERS STREET, OXFORD STREET;
THE PROTESTANT ALLIANCE, 430 STRAND, W.C.

PREFACE.

THIS work contains, it is hoped, a complete refutation of Popery in a short space.

The Author's motto has been—

"*Multum in Parvo.*"

Romish dogmas and practices are exhibited from Roman Catholic authorities; and Romish arguments answered fully, but without circumlocution.

This work was first published in 1851; but since then the Church of Rome has twice altered her creed (1854, 1870). Some alterations have been made in this edition to meet the new developments.

The utmost reliance may be placed on the extracts and authorities, as they have been either verified in, or taken with great care from, the original works.

Surely, in this day of rebuke and blasphemy, when "Great Babylon" is again holding out her "golden cup" to the nations, it behoves every Christian Protestant to contend earnestly for the "faith which was once delivered to the saints."

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

THE RULE OF FAITH—PART I.

TRADITION NOT THE RULE.

The Romish Rule explained from Standard Romish Authorities and Works to be Scripture and Tradition, and the teaching of the Church.

Arguments in favour of Tradition, answered.

Arguments against Tradition. 25–33

CHAPTER II.

THE RULE OF FAITH—PART II.

THE CHURCH NOT THE RULE—DIVISION I.

Romish Meaning of Church.

Arguments in favour of the Doctrine of an Infallible Church answered.

No Analogy between Courts of Justice and the Councils of the Church of Rome.

The alleged Inconvenience of Private Judgment considered.

Scripture does not prove the Infallibility of any Church, much less the Church of Rome. 33–44

CHAPTER III.

THE RULE OF FAITH—PART III.

THE CHURCH NOT THE RULE—DIVISION II.

The real Question, after all, between Protestants and Romanists is, Whether Theologians, comparatively few in number, assembled in Council, are Infallible?

Arguments against such Infallibility.

Councils have no Infallible Authority in proof of their Infallibility.

Romanists until 1870 could not tell where Infallibility resides.

Romish Councils are not General.

Councils have contradicted each other.

No Infallible Authority has decided which of the Councils are Infallible, and which not.

If Councils be Infallible, the Church had no Infallible Guide until A.D. 325.

Councils have evidenced their Fallibility, by requiring Belief in Doctrines which are false.

Such Infallibility is practically useless.
The very Silence of Scripture as to Infallibility, disproves the Dogma.
The Scriptures plainly disprove the notion of Infallibility. 44–56

CHAPTER IV.

THE RULE OF FAITH—PART IV.

THE BIBLE THE ONLY RULE.

Arguments against the Sufficiency of Scripture answered.
Proof that the Bible is the Rule.
The written Law was the Standard of appeal under the Mosaic dispensation, and to Christ and His Apostles. 56–66

CHAPTER V.

THE SEVEN SACRAMENTS—PART I.

ARE THERE SEVEN?

Five have been added by Rome.
The non-sacramental character of the five new Sacraments proved.
Arguments for Clerical Celibacy answered.
Admissions of learned Romanists on the Subject.
According to the Doctrine of Intention, no Romanist can be certain that he receives true Sacraments. . . 66–74

CHAPTER VI.

THE SEVEN SACRAMENTS—PART II.

PENANCE.

The Doctrine of Rome as to Penance.
Texts advanced in favour of the Doctrine that the Priest can forgive Sins, explained.
This Romish Tribunal without authority in the Bible. 74–82

CHAPTER VII.

THE SEVEN SACRAMENTS—PART III.

PENANCE AND AURICULAR CONFESSION.

Arguments in favour of Auricular Confession answered.
Arguments against such Confession.
It is an Infringement upon the Prerogatives of God.
It gives undue power to the Priesthood for their own purposes and the purposes of the Church.
It is immoral in its character. 82–90

CHAPTER VIII.

SOME OF THE APPROVED RITES AND CEREMONIES OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

The Ordination of Exorcists.
The Ordination of Priests.
The Consecration of Bishops.
The making of Holy Water, Holy Ashes, Holy Mortar, Holy Incense, Holy Bells, Holy Oil, the Devil driven out of Oil, Holy Chrism, and the Adoration of Chrism. 90–97

CHAPTER IX.

JUSTIFICATION AND ORIGINAL SIN.

Way of Salvation as Taught by the Church of Rome.
The Case stated.
The Scriptures prove that Justification cannot be increased nor lost.
And that the Sinner is Justified by Faith only, and not by the Works of the Law. 97–107

CHAPTER X.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION—PART I.

NOT PROVED BY THE BIBLE.

The Doctrine of Transubstantiation exhibited from Romish Works.
Admissions of learned Romanists on the Subject.
The Discourse of Christ recorded in the 6th chapter of John, does not prove Transubstantiation.
The words of Institution do not prove it. . . 107–119

CHAPTER XI.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION—PART II.

THE UNCERTAINTY OF CONSECRATION—THE POISONED HOST —IDOLATRY.

Various Defects which may prevent consecration, enumerated in the Roman Missal.
The Ceremony of the *Proba*.
The Pope himself does not venture to receive the Consecrated Host until it has been first tasted.
Persons have been poisoned by the Wafer.
The great object of Romish Worship—the Host, may be only a poisoned Cake! 119–126

CHAPTER XII.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION—PART III.

OPPOSED TO SCRIPTURE AND THE SENSES.

The Bible teaches that Christ is bodily absent from us.
When Christ bodily comes, it will be in the clouds of Heaven.
Remarkable Prophecy.
Christ's Humiliation has terminated. It is not continued in Transubstantiation.
Christ's Body cannot see Corruption, the Wafer can.
The Wafer is made, and therefore, according to the principle of the Bible, it cannot be God.
Transubstantiation subverts the Evidence of all Human Belief, in denying the Testimony of the Senses. 126–134

CHAPTER XIII.

THE MASS—PART I.

NOT SUPPORTED BY SCRIPTURE.

The Doctrine of the Mass.
Arguments in favour of the Mass answered.
The Sacrifices of the Christian Dispensation are those of Prayer and Praise.
Melchisedek brought forth Bread and Wine for the refreshment of Abraham and his Followers, and not to sacrifice.
This is corroborated by Josephus. . . . 134–141

CHAPTER XIV.

THE MASS—PART II.

CONTRARY TO SCRIPTURE.

Negative Scripture Argument against the Mass.
The Apostles were sent to Preach, not to Sacrifice.
There are no Sacrificing Priests under the Gospel Dispensation.
The Apostles, in giving directions to Timothy and Titus for the Government of the Church, and discharge of various Duties, nowhere allude to Sacrifice.
The Account of the early Christian Assemblies gives no Intimation of Sacrifice.
Positive Scripture Argument against the Mass.
Rev. George Hamilton on the Differences between the Mass and the Lord's Supper. . . . 141–151

CHAPTER XV.

COMMUNION IN ONE KIND

Romish Arguments in favour of, answered.

Vindication of Protestant Translation of 1 Cor. xi. 27.
Reasons against Communion in One Kind.
Admissions of Romish Authorities upon the Subject. 151–158

CHAPTER XVI.

PURGATORY.

The Doctrine of the Church of Rome as to Purgatory.
Venial Sin disproved.
Explanation of Texts quoted in favour of Purgatory.
Purgatory disproved by the Bible. . . 158–172

CHAPTER XVII.

SAINT-WORSHIP—PART I.

Distinctions of Worship maintained by the Church of Rome.
Romish Worship of the Virgin.
Immaculate Conception.
Prayers to God through the Merits of Saints, and the Invocation of Saints. 172–186

CHAPTER XVIII.

INVOCATION OF SAINTS—PART II.

CONTRARY TO SCRIPTURE.

Arguments in favour of such Invocation refuted.
No one can know Infallibly who are Saints.
Saints in Heaven cannot hear our Prayers.
No Instance in Scripture of Prayer to a Dead Saint.
The Scriptures repudiate Saint-Worship.
Christ is the Sole Mediator.
The Invocation of Saints arises from the spirit of Antichrist.
None can Mediate in Heaven but Christ. . 186–197

CHAPTER XIX.

IMAGES—PART I.

Romish Differences.
Illustrations of Romish Image-Worship.
Benediction of Images.
Prayers to Images.
The Adoration of Images, and their Miraculous Character.
The Wood Worshipped. . . . 197–204

CHAPTER XX.

IMAGE-WORSHIP—PART II.

CONDEMNED BY SCRIPTURE.

Arguments in favour of Images answered.

Admissions of Learned Romanists as to Images.
Romish Treatment of the Second Commandment. 205–210

CHAPTER XXI.

INDULGENCES.

Their Nature.
Specimens of Indulgences.
The Reasons upon which Indulgences are founded, fallacious. 210–218

CHAPTER XXII.

THE PAPAL SUPREMACY.

Texts quoted in favour of Papal Supremacy, explained.
Scripture against Papal Supremacy.
Rome not the Mistress of all Churches. . . 218–227

CHAPTER XXIII.

COUNCILS SANCTION PERSECUTION.

Saints and Popes teach, that Heretics should be exterminated.
The Council of Trent inculcates such principles as are utterly incompatible with Liberty.
The 3d Canon of the 4th Council of Lateran teaches the same. 227–234

CHAPTER XXIV.

THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV. NOT TRUE, NOT CATHOLIC, AND NOT NECESSARY TO SALVATION.

The Creed of the Church of Rome.
A New Creed.
No Church ever held it before the year of our Lord 1564.
Salvation is through Christ. . . . 235–242

CHAPTER XXV.

QUESTIONS TO ROMAN CATHOLICS ON THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV. 242–253

AND

SUPPLEMENTAL PAPER. . . . 253–257

TABLE OF ROME'S GENERAL COUNCILS. 257–258

ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF PIUS IX., Dec. 8, 1864, 259–298

SYNOPSIS, ... 9–24
INDEX, ... 301–310
INDEX OF TEXTS, 311–312

SYNOPSIS.

CHAPTER I.

THE RULE OF FAITH.—TRADITION NOT THE RULE.

I. "I most stedfastly admit and embrace Apostolic and Ecclesiastical Traditions, and all other observances and constitutions of the same Church.

II. "I also admit the Holy Scripture, according to that sense which our Holy Mother, the Church, has held and does hold, to which it belongs, to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures; neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers." —*First Two Articles of Creed of Pope Pius IV.*

All admit the necessity of a rule or standard of faith, 25.

The Romish Rule theoretically is Scripture and Tradition, 25.

The Council of Trent pays equal respect to Scripture and Tradition. According to Rome (quotation from Bossuet) there is an unwritten word, as well as written, 26.

The Romish Rule practically is the Decrees of Popes, or Councils sanctioned by Popes, 27. Dr. Milner quoted in proof, 27.

Romish Arguments (answered):—

1. Before the Mosaic age there was no written law. Answer—Then less necessary than now, and yet corruption prevailed, 27.
2. All that Christ did is not written. Answer—All is written that is essential, 28.
3. The disciples were not fully instructed by Christ. Answer—They were fully instructed after the Pentecost, 28.
4. The Apostles command the ordinances to be kept. Answer—All is written that is essential, 28.
5. "The rest will I set in order when I come." Answer—the same as No. 4, 28.
6. Whatever was delivered by the Apostles is to be held fast. Answer—Most true; but Rome cannot prove that her Traditions are apostolic, 29.
7. The exhortation to "hold fast the form of sound words" only proves the necessity of adhering to apostolic teaching, 29.
8. All that is essential about the Apostles is written, 29.

Tradition not the Rule.

1. Oral Tradition untrustworthy, 30.
   Scriptural case proving this from John xxi. 22, 23. 30.
2. The Fathers contradict each other, 30.
3. The Romish Rule inaccessible, 31.
4. Tradition is condemned by Christ, and by the apostles, 32.
   Rome cannot prove her Tradition divine, 32.

CHAPTER II.

THE RULE OF FAITH.—THE CHURCH NOT THE RULE.

The Romish Rule practically is the *ipse dixit* of Popes, or of a few divines assembled in Council sanctioned by the Pope, 34.

Romish Assumptions as to the Church. She applies the word Church to herself alone, and denies the Christianity of all other Churches, 34.

Where is Infallibility? in the Church diffusive? or in Councils? or in the Pope? or in Councils with the Pope at their head? 34.

Romish Arguments for Infallibility:—

I. As there are temporal Judges, there ought to be spiritual Judges to determine infallibly in controversy, 35.

Answer—1. We have to consider, not what ought to be, but what *is*. The temporal Judge is *final*, but not *infallible*, 35.

2. No parallel between temporal and spiritual Judges, 35.

3. Romish Infallibility practically useless, 35.

4. The Pope and clergy are interested in the question in controversy, and therefore are not qualified for the office of Judge, 36.

5. God is the only infallible Judge, 36.

II. The Authority of the Church is necessary to prove the Inspiration of the Bible. Answer—We have the same evidence as the Church of Rome, and to this she must ultimately appeal in the case of the Heathen and all unbelievers, 36.

III. The alleged inconvenience of Private Judgment on account of divisions, 37.

Answer—1. The Romish pretension cannot remedy the evil, 37.

2. The evil is not prevented within the pale of the Romish communion, there being within her pale only an external uniformity, and Schisms even in the Popedom being frequent, 38.

3. This objection as to divisions might be urged against the primitive Church, 39.

IV. Texts of Scripture quoted for Infallibility:—

1. Matt. xvi. 18, "Thou art Peter," &c. Answer—(*a*) Peter was not the Rock, but Christ. Peter was to receive only the keys, 39.

(*b*) Romish difference of opinion on this passage is self-destructive. Romanists have split on the Rock of the Church, 40.

2. Matt. xxviii. 20, "Lo, I am," &c. Answer—This is a promise of the divine presence to *all* believers, but does not imply Infallibility to *any*, 41.

3. Matt. xviii. 15–17. Answer—This no more proves the Infallibility of the church or congregation than it does of the offending brother, or the one or two witnesses, 41.
4. 1 Tim. iii. 15, "The pillar and ground of truth." Answer—This is applied to the Church of Ephesus, which afterwards fell, Rev. xi. 5. 42.
5. The promises of the Old Testament as to the universality of the Church. This relates to millennial times. Rome is not the Church, 42.

CHAPTER III.

THE RULE OF FAITH.—THE CHURCH NOT THE RULE.

The real question between Protestants and Romanists is simply whether the Decrees of Popes, or of a few ecclesiastics assembled in Council sanctioned by Popes, are infallible, 45.
I. Romish Infallibility rests on a fallible foundation, 45.
No infallible authority has declared that Rome is infallible, 45.
Many points regarding the constitution of a General Council would require to be infallibly fixed, 46.
II. Rome as to the locality of her Infallibility, 46.
Cases in which a Pope and Council could not agree, as when the Pope's own orthodoxy is questioned, 47.
III. Romish Councils are not General, 47.
IV. Councils have contradicted each other, 48.
V. An infallible Judge would be necessary to settle infallibly the differences of Councils, 49.
VI. The Primitive Church had no General Council, 49.
VII. Councils have given evidence of their fallibility by false doctrine and contradictions, 50.
VIII. Romish Infallibility practically useless, as that Church has given no infallible exposition of Scripture, and the doctrine of Intention carries doubt into every religious service, 50.
IX. The silence of Scripture disproves Infallibility, 50.
Chillingworth on this point, 51.
X. Infallibility disproved by Scripture. The angels and our first parents fell. The Jewish Church fell. The Seven Churches fallible. Rome declared to be fallible, Rom. xi. 18–22. 53.

CHAPTER IV.

THE RULE OF FAITH—THE BIBLE THE ONLY RULE.

The Bible is the Rule, but not Tradition and the Church, 56.
Objections to the Bible as the Rule :—
1. Differences among Protestants, but this has no more validity than the fact that there were differences among the hearers of Christ 57

2. Alleged want of Scripture proof for Infant Baptism. Proof given, 57.
3. Alleged want of proof for the change of the Sabbath. Proof given, 58.
4. Alleged want of proof for the procession of the Holy Ghost. Proof given, 58.
5. Peter says, "No Scripture is of private interpretation." Answer—He means that no Scripture is of private origin, and calls the word of prophecy more sure than the voice which came from heaven, 58.
6. Peter's reference to difficulties in the Epistles of Paul. Answer—No argument against Private Judgment. We are to "desire the sincere milk of the word," 59.

Proof that the Bible is the Rule :—

1. Scripture the Mosaic Rule, proved abundantly from Scripture, 60.
2. Scripture the Apostolic Rule, also so proved, 62.
3. The Bible, alone inspired, alone the Rule, 64.

CHAPTER V.

THE SEVEN SACRAMENTS.—ARE THERE SEVEN?

III. "I also profess, that there are truly and properly Seven Sacraments of the new law instituted by Jesus Christ, our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not all for every one; to wit, Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony, and that they confer grace; and that of these, Baptism, Confirmation, and Orders, cannot be reiterated without sacrilege: and I also receive and admit the received and approved ceremonies of the Catholic Church, used in the solemn administration of all the aforesaid Sacraments."

The Church of Rome admits that appointment by Christ, with an outward element, is necessary to the institution of a Sacrament, 66.

The True Sacraments :—

I. Baptism, proved, 66.
II. The Lord's Supper, proved, 67.

The False Sacraments :—

I. Confirmation was not instituted by Christ. It is a Church ordinance. Dr Doyle admits the time of its institution to be uncertain, 67.
II. Penance not instituted by Christ, 67.
III. Extreme Unction not instituted by Christ. Bellarmine on the anointing in Mark vi. 13.—Cajetan on James v. 14, 15. Dr Doyle makes *same* admission as to Extreme Unction as above, 67.
IV. Orders had no outward element appointed by Christ, 69.

V. Matrimony instituted in Paradise. Dr Doyle's Admission—Cajetan's Admission, 69.
Clerical Celibacy not proveable by Scripture, 69.
Explanation of 1 Cor. vii. 8, about marriage, 69.
Clerical Marriage lawful according to Scripture, 70.
Eminent writers in the Church of Rome have made Admissions as to the septenary number, 70.
Admissions of Romanists as to the Sacraments, 70.
Peter Lombard was the first who defined the septenary number, 71.
The Fathers on the Sacraments, 71.
Jerome, Augustine, and Chrysostom quoted, 71, 72.
It cannot be proved that any man, for a thousand years after Christ, taught that the Sacraments are seven, neither more nor less. Sir Humphrey Lynde's challenge on this point, 71.
The Doctrine of Intention, as taught by Council of Trent, 72.
No one can be certain that he has a Sacrament, 73.
Bellarmine quoted, 73.

CHAPTER VI.

THE SEVEN SACRAMENTS.—PENANCE.

The Church of Rome teaches that Penance is a tribunal for the pardon of sin, 75.
Romish Absolution judicial. Council of Trent quoted, 75.
Rome requires Contrition or Attrition. *Abridgment of Christian Doctrine* quoted, 75.
Romish Doctrine as to the necessity of Absolution. Roman Catholic Tract quoted, 76.
Romish Arguments on Absolution:—
Explanation of John xx. 21–23—
1. Essential difference between the mission of Christ and of his Apostles, 77.
2. Even if the Apostles could forgive, it does not follow that the priests of Rome can, 77.
3. The priests are not the successors of the Apostles, 77.
4. The Apostles never judicially forgave sin, 78.
5. The Church of Rome does not receive the words literally, 78.
6. The true meaning is that the Apostles remitted sin by preaching the Gospel, 78.
Explanation of Matt. xviii. 18, as to binding and loosing. Instance given from Acts xv. 28. 79.
Romish Absolution refuted:—
1. The notion without authority, 80.
2. The Apostles remitted sin by preaching, 80.
3. The Apostles nowhere speak of such a Tribunal in their writings, 81.

4. Remission of sin and salvation are connected with faith in Christ, 81.

CHAPTER VII.

THE SEVEN SACRAMENTS—PENANCE, AURICULAR CONFESSION.

Auricular Confession is based upon the supposed power of the priest to forgive sins, 83.

The Priest an assumed Judge. Quotation from *Grounds of Catholic Doctrine*, 83.

And Rome requires her members to confess to him, 83.

Scripture does not warrant Auricular Confession. The same quoted, 83.

1. The leper was commanded to show himself to the priest. Leprosy was a type of sin, and the priest a type of Christ, to whom we are to confess our sin, 84.
2. The duty of confessing sin acknowledged, but private Sacramental Confession is another thing, 84.
3. The command in James v. 16, "Confess your faults one to another," implying that it is the duty of the priest to confess to the layman, as well as the layman to the priest, is against Auricular Confession, 84.
4. Those who confessed, according to Acts xix. 18, did so openly, 85.

Auricular Confession refuted:—

I. It is an infringment upon the prerogative of God, 85.

II. It gives undue power to the priest, 85.

1. The confessor employs an indirect influence, 85.
2. He employs a direct influence, 85.
3. For the Church, 86.
4. For his own purposes. In carrying out his designs in immoralities, 87.

The Confessional Immoral from the very nature of the case, females being compelled to speak on indelicate subjects to the priest. Liguori admits that immorality has taken place in the Confessional, 87.

CHAPTER VIII.

SOME OF THE APPROVED RITES AND CEREMONIES OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

III. "And I also receive and admit the received and approved ceremonies of the Catholic Church, used in the solemn administration of all the aforesaid Sacraments."

Of the Ordination of Exorcists, 90.

Of the Ordination of Priests, 91.

Of the Consecration of Bishops, 92.
Of the Making of Holy Water, in laying the Foundation-Stone of a Church, 93.
Holy Ashes, 94.
Holy Mortar, 94.
Holy Incense, 94.
Holy Bells, 95.
Holy Oil—the Devil driven out of Oil—Holy Chrism, and the Adoration of Chrism, 95.
Extreme Unction, 96.
Observations :—
1. These ceremonies unreasonable and unscriptural, 97.
2. Romanism is a religion of ceremony, 97.
3. These ceremonies contribute to the degradation of Romish countries, 97.

CHAPTER IX.

JUSTIFICATION AND ORIGINAL SIN.

IV. "I embrace and receive all and every one of the things which have been defined and declared in the Holy Council of Trent, concerning Original Sin and Justification."

Romish Way of Salvation, Council of Trent being quoted, 98.
1. She rejects Justification by Faith only, 99.
2. She teaches that Grace may be lost, 99.
3. That Justification may be increased, 99.
4. The Merit of Works, 99.
A Work, called *Indulgences granted by Sovereign Pontiffs,* quoted, 99.
Romish Way of Salvation in brief, 100.
Errors of the Scheme :—
1. That Baptism justifies, 100.
2. That the Intention of the priest is necessary, 101.
3. That if Intention be wanting, Justification is not given, 101.
4. That Justification may be increased, 101.
5. That Justification may be lost, 101.
6. That Sin may be distinguished into Venial and Mortal, 101.
7. That Grace lost by Mortal Sin may be restored in the Tribunal of Penance, 101.
8. That the Absolution of the priest restores the soul, 101.
9. That Venial Sin may be atoned for by Good Works, 101.
10. That Works are meritorious, 101.
11. That those who die in Venial Sin, or whose temporal punishment remains, must go to Purgatory, 101.
Augustine quoted on the *Grace of God* as saving men, 100–102.
Answers—I. Baptism is not Justification, 102.

II. Justification is complete, 102.
III. Justification cannot be lost, 103.
IV. Good Works are not meritorious, 104.
V. Faith only justifies, 104.
VI. Good Works are the Fruits and Evidence of Faith, 104.
Cruelty and uncertainty of Rome's Way of Salvation contrasted with the love and surety of that taught in Scripture, 105.

CHAPTER X.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION NOT PROVED BY THE BIBLE.

(PART FIRST.)

V. "I profess, likewise, that in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead; and that in the most Holy Sacraments of the Eucharist there are truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, together with soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood; which conversion the Catholic Church calls Transubstantiation. I also confess, that under either kind alone, Christ is received whole and entire, and a true Sacrament."

Transubstantiation as taught by Rome—the natural elements do not remain. Each crumb contains a whole Christ, 107.
The Host, or particles consecrated, though reserved, contain a whole Christ, 108.
The Council of Trent quoted; also its Catechism, 108, 109.
The Host worshipped with Latria, 109.
Admission of Romanists on this subject, 109.
Romish Arguments refuted. John vi. 53–56 referred to, 110.
I. The passage has no direct reference to the Sacrament, 110.
II. The passage must be understood literally or figuratively. Rome does not carry out the literal interpretation, 111.
1. If understood literally, infants are lost, 111.
2. If understood literally, all communicants are saved, 111.
3. If understood literally, Christ's body came down from heaven, 112.
4. If understood literally, there are two ways of salvation—by a Sacrament, and by faith, 112.
III. The passage must be understood figuratively. Augustine's opinion to that effect, and the remark of Maldonatus thereon, 112.
The Words of Institution are quoted:—
1. The Feast commemorative, as was the Passover, 113.
2. The apostolic reception of the words, 114.
3. The Feast proved to be commemorative from Christ's words, 114.
4. The literal acceptation refutes Transubstantiation, 115.
5. The apostolic account refutes Transubstantiation, 115.

6. The Church of Rome inconsistent with herself as to literal interpretation, 116.

Instances of the figurative language of Scripture, 116.

1 Cor. xi. 29 is also quoted; but the Romanists do not accept the words literally themselves, and the language of Paul in Gal. iii. 1 is similar, though clearly not literal.

CHAPTER XI.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION—THE UNCERTAINTY OF CONSECRATION —THE POISONED HOST—IDOLATRY.

(PART SECOND.)

Of Defects occurring in the Celebration of the Mass, 119.

Of Defects in the Matter, 119.

Of Defects in the Bread, 120.

Of Defects in the Wine, 120.

Of Defects in the Form (or Procedure), 120.

Of Defects in the Minister, 120.

Of Defects of Intention, 120

Of Defects in Disposition of Mind, 121.

Of Defects in Disposition of Body, 121.

Of Disposition in the Ministration itself, 121.

The Proba, or Poisoned Host, 122.

1. Persons have been poisoned by the Host, 123.
2. When a Bishop sings Mass, the *Proba* is used, 123.
3. Rome cares more for the bodies of her Clergy than for the souls of the people, 123.
4. Romanists have no surety that in worshipping the Host they worship God, 123.
5. No true worship of God in the Mass, 123.
6. Rome in this matter guilty of wilful sin, 124.

CHAPTER XII.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION—OPPOSED TO SCRIPTURE AND THE SENSES.

(PART THIRD.)

I. Christ bodily absent from us, 126.

II. The Law forbids the use of Blood, 127.

III. Christ will come bodily at his Second Advent, 127.

IV. Christ not subject to humiliation, 128.

Pocket Missal and *Roman Missal* quoted, 128.

V. Christ's body not corruptible, 129.

VI. The Host, the work of hands, 130.

VII. Transubstantiation destroys the nature of a Sacrament, 131.

VIII The Senses *v.* Transubstantiation, 131.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE MASS—NOT SUPPORTED BY SCRIPTURE.

(PART FIRST.)

The Mass is founded on Transubstantiation, 134.
Council of Trent and Bossuet quoted, 134, 135.
Scripture Texts considered, quoted by the *Grounds of Catholic Doctrine*, 135.
The Words of Consecration,—"This is the chalice, the New Testament in my blood, which *shall* be shed for you." "Shall," a mistranslation. Romanists in a dilemma as to this, 135.
The prophecy of Malachi (i. 11) relates to spiritual sacrifice, 136.
Fathers on Sacrifice, 137.
The bread and wine of Melchisedek were brought forth for refreshment, Genesis xiv. 18. The testimony of Josephus, 138.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE MASS—CONTRARY TO SCRIPTURE.

(PART SECOND.)

Negative Scripture Argument against the Mass :—
I. The Apostles not sacrificers, but preachers of the Gospel, 142.
II. The Apostles did not commission others to offer literal sacrifice, 144.
III. Literal sacrifice not a part of Primitive Worship, 144.
Positive Scripture Argument against the Mass :—
Jesus Christ offered for sin but once on Calvary, 145.
Rev. Geo. Hamilton's Sixteen Points of Difference between the Mass and the Lord's Supper, 147.

CHAPTER XV.

COMMUNION IN ONE KIND.

Romish Arguments in favour of Communion in One Kind:—
Grounds of Catholic Doctrine quoted, 151.
John vi. 51 does not refer to the Lord's Supper, and is no proof of Communion in One Kind, 151.
Texts speaking of the bread, without mention of the wine, are mere incidental allusions, 152.
Romish version of 1 Cor. xi. 27, does not warrant Communion in One Kind, 153.
The Protestant translation not incorrect, Venn on this point, 153.
Romish reasons for withholding the cup, 155.
Reasons against Communion in One Kind :—
1. Both kinds instituted by Christ, 156.
2. Half Communion admitted to be a novelty, 156.

CHAPTER XVI.

PURGATORY.

VI. "I constantly hold that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls detained therein are helped by the suffrages of the faithful."

Purgatory a place of punishment, 158.
Purgatory a place of fiery punishment, 158.
Catechism of Council of Trent and *Grounds of Catholic Doctrine* quoted, 158, 159.
Purgatory purges away Venial Sin, and inflicts the temporal punishment of sin, 159.
St Christina's Description of Purgatory, 159.
Romish Arguments for Venial Sin, 161.
Abridgment of Christian Doctrine quoted, 161.
All Sin is Mortal, 161.
The Romish Doctrine immoral, 162.
Romish Doctors differ as to the distinctions of Venial and Mortal Sin, 163.
Temporal punishment of sin does not exist beyond the grave, 163.
Texts quoted in favour of Purgatory :—
1. Matt. v. 25, 26, "Agree with thine adversary," &c. Answer—The sinner remains in the prison till he pays the uttermost farthing,—remains for ever, because he has nothing wherewith to pay, 164.
Douay Annotators on the word "till," 164.
Jerome on this passage, 165.
2. Matt. xii. 32, "And whosoever speaketh," &c. Answer—The parallel passages show that he has never forgiveness, Mark iii. 29. 165.
3. 1 Cor. iii. 13–15, "Every man's work," &c. Answer—This cannot relate to Purgatory, to which every man does not go. It refers to the fire of judgment, 165.
Bellarmine on this passage, 166.
4. 1 Peter iii. 18–20, "By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison," &c. Answer—This cannot refer to Purgatory, because the antediluvians were guilty of mortal sin, and therefore were not in Purgatory. Christ preached by the Spirit in Noah, 167.
Texts against Purgatory :—
1. Purgatory inconsistent with complete Justification through Christ, 167.
2. Purgatory contradicts the blessed truth that when the believer dies, he enters into rest, 168.
Pearson on the word "hell," in the Apostles' Creed, 168.

CHAPTER XVII.

SAINT-WORSHIP.

(PART FIRST.)

VII. "Likewise, that the Saints, reigning together with Christ, are to be honoured and invocated: and that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to be held in veneration."

Rome's Distinction of Worship into *Latria*, *Hyperdulia*, and *Dulia*, is false in theory and useless in practice, 172.

Religious Worship given to Mary:—

I. Festivals of Mary, 173.

Devotions of the Sacred Heart and *Roman Breviary* quoted, 173, 174.

II. Mary is represented as the Mother of Mercy, 175.

Glories of Mary quoted, 175.

III. The Psalter of the Virgin, 176.

IV. Sodalities (or Societies) of the Virgin, 178.

The *Scapular* and its Virtues. *History of the Scapular* quoted, 178.

The Immaculate Conception, 179.

Fathers against the Immaculate Conception, 180.

Romish doctors against do. do. 180.

Saints against do. do. 181.

Popes against do. do. 181.

The Pope now accepts the doctrine. Extract from the *Bull of Pius IX.*, 8th Dec. 1854, 182.

Scripture against the doctrine, 183.

Religious Worship given to Saints, 183.

Religious Worship through the Merits of Saints, 184.

CHAPTER XVIII.

INVOCATION OF SAINTS CONTRARY TO SCRIPTURE.

(PART SECOND.)

Romish Arguments for Saint-Worship:—

1. Zechariah i. 12, where the Angel of the Lord intercedes for Jerusalem. Answer—The angel is the Lord Jesus, the angel of the covenant, 186.

Cyril of Alexandria quoted, 187.

2. Rev. v. 8, where the Elders are represented as having "golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of saints." Answer—They represent the Church on earth, and the prayers which they offer are their own prayers, 187.

3. Heb. xii. 22, "Ye are come . . . . to an innumerable company of angels." Answer—Not a word said in the text about intercession by Saints or Angels, 188.

4. Luke xvi. 27, 28, "Father Abraham, send Lazarus," &c. Answer—The conduct of a lost soul is no safe guide to Christians, 188.
5. Rev. vi. 10, "How long," &c. Answer—This is similar to the declaration, "The voice of thy brother's blood," &c. (Gen. iv. 10), 188.
6. Luke xvi. 9, "Make to yourselves," &c. Answer—The Saints are not mammon, 188.
7. Living Christians are commanded to pray *for* each other Answer—This does not authorise the living to pray *to* or *for* the dead. Heaven is the holy of holies, where Christ, the High Priest, alone intercedes, 188.
8. Luke xv. 10, "There is joy," &c.; and 1 Cor. iv. 9, "Spectacle to angels and men," &c. Answer—The Saints know nothing of the sinner's conversion until informed of it by the good Shepherd, who says, "Rejoice with me, for I have found my sheep which was lost." The fact that the Apostles were a spectacle to Angels is no more a proof of the omniscience of Angels than of men, to whom also they were a spectacle, 188.

Arguments against Saint-Worship :—

I. We cannot infallibly know who are Saints, 189.
   The Saints are canonized on account of alleged Miracles. Specimens given, 190.
II. The Saints cannot hear our prayers, 191.
   Romanists are in a difficulty as to *how* Saints hear prayer, some supposing, (1) That they receive their information from the Angels! others, (2) That they have a wonderful celerity of locomotion; some, (3) That they see all things in God; others, (4) That prayers to them are revealed by God to their minds.
III. No prayer to Saints in Scripture, 192.
IV. Scripture forbids Saint-Worship, 192.
   Priest Keenan's dishonesty in quoting Scripture on this point, 193.
V. Christ is the only Mediator, 193.
VI. Invocation of Saints antichristian, 194.
VII. Christ alone mediates in heaven, 195.

CHAPTER XIX.

IMAGES.

(PART FIRST.)

VIII. "I most firmly assert, that the Images of Christ, of the Mother of God, ever Virgin, and also of other Saints, may be had and retained; and that due honour and veneration are to be given them."

Differences among Romanists on Image-Worship, 198.

Second Council of Nice contrasted with Aquinas and *Roman Pontifical*, 198.
Image-Worship as practised by Rome:—
Adoration of the Cross, 199.
Benediction of the Cross and Incense, 200.
Benediction of the Image of the Virgin, 201.
Prayers to the Cross, 202.
Wood of the Cross worshipped, 202.
Worship of Images decreed by Council of Nice, 203.
Instances of Miracles said to be wrought by Images, 203.

CHAPTER XX.

IMAGE-WORSHIP CONDEMNED BY SCRIPTURE.

(PART SECOND.)

Romish Arguments for Image-Worship:—
Grounds of Catholic Doctrine quoted, 205.
I. The Cherubims were made by express command. Answer—They were never worshipped, 205.
II. The Brazen Serpent was made by divine command. Answer—Hezekiah brake it in pieces when the people adored it, 2 Kings xviii. 4. 206.
Admission of learned Romanists as to Images, 206.
Scripture texts against Image-Worship, 207.
Some Roman Catholic Catechisms leave out our Second Commandment, of which Examples are given, 208.

CHAPTER XXI.

INDULGENCES.

IX. "I also affirm, that the power of Indulgences was left by Christ in the Church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people."

The Doctrine of Indulgences is founded on that of Supererogation, 211.
A Work, called *Indulgences granted by Sovereign Pontiffs*, quoted, 211.
Specimens of Indulgences, 213.
Romish Arguments for Indulgences, 215.
The doctrine presupposes,—
1. That God's chastisement is penal, 216.
2. That the Works of Saints are superabundant, 216.
3. That to the Pope is committed the guardianship of the treasury of human merit; all of which suppositions are proved false, 217.
Rules of the *Purgatorian Society* given, 215.

CHAPTER XXII.

THE PAPAL SUPREMACY.

A. "I acknowledge the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church, for the Mother and Mistress of all Churches, and I promise *and swear* true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, successor to St Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ."

Texts quoted in favour of the Papal Supremacy:—

I. Matt. xvi. 18, "*Thou art Peter, and upon this rock,*" &c. Answer—Christ is the Rock, 218.

1. Christ did not say, "upon thee," but "upon *this* rock *I* will build *my* Church, ... and *I* will give unto *thee* the keys," 219.
2. Man is not spoken of as a rock, 219.
3. Many of the Fathers teach that Christ is the Rock. Augustine and Jerome quoted, 219.
4. Romanists differ in the interpretation of the passage, 220.

II. Matt. xvi. 19, "I will give unto thee the keys," 221.

Answer—1. Peter, by the key of preaching, opened the door of the Church to the Jews (Acts ii. 4), to the Gentiles (Acts x.), 221.

2. The declaration as to binding and loosing was made to all the Apostles, 221.

III. Luke xxii. 31, "And the Lord said, Simon, Simon," &c. Answer—This text reminds us of his fall, instead of proving his Supremacy, 221.

IV. John xxi. 15, The threefold question, "Lovest thou me?" Answer—That no Supremacy was conferred, is evident from the fact that Peter was grieved by Christ's address, 222.

Texts against Papal Supremacy:—

1. Christ taught that all the Apostles were equal, Mark x. 42–45. 222.
2. Peter himself nowhere alludes to such Supremacy, but calls himself one of many Elders, 1 Peter v. 1. 223.
3. Peter was sent by the Apostles to preach in Samaria, Acts viii. 14. 223.
4. The sentence at the Council in Jerusalem was given by James, not by Peter. 223.
5. Paul was not a whit behind "the very chiefest apostles," 2 Cor. xi. 5. 223.
6. Peter is called one of three pillars, not the foundation, Gal. ii. 9. 223.
7. Paul withstood Peter to the face, Gal. ii. 11. 223.
8. Popes are not mentioned in the list of Church Officers, Ephes iv. 11. 223.

Rome not the Mistress of all Churches, 223.

Grounds of Catholic Doctrine quoted, 223.

1. *Peter was not Bishop of Rome*, 224
2. *Even if he had been, he was not supreme*, 224.
3. *The Pope is not his Successor*, either in infallibility, miraculous gifts, or doctrine, 224.

Peter is said to have been Bishop of Antioch before he was of Rome. The Eastern Church has a more plausible claim than the Roman to Supremacy, 224.

CHAPTER XXIII.

COUNCILS SANCTION PERSECUTION.

XI. "I likewise undoubtedly receive and profess all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the Sacred Canons and General Councils, and particularly by the Holy Council of Trent; and I condemn, reject, and anathematise all things contrary thereto, and all heresies, which the Church condemned, rejected, and anathematised."

Councils Intolerant, as are also Aquinas and very many Popes. Specimens given, 227.

Rome (Council of Trent) acknowledges the Baptism of Heretics, and claims all the Baptised, 229.

The Baptised to be compelled to receive Confirmation, 230.

Civil Rulers bound to enforce the Rites of the Church, 230.

Council of Trent and Bull of Pius IV. quoted, 231.

Council of Lateran and its persecuting Decrees, 231.

CHAPTER XXIV.

THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV. NOT TRUE, NOT CATHOLIC, AND NOT NECESSARY TO SALVATION.

XII. "I, N. N., do at this present freely profess, and sincerely hold this true Catholic faith, without which no one can be saved; and I promise most constantly to retain and confess the same entire and inviolate, with God's assistance, to the end of my life.

"And I will take care, as far as in me lies, that it shall be held, taught, and preached by my subjects, or by those the care of whom shall appertain to me in my situation. This I promise, vow, and swear. So help me God, and these holy Gospels of God."

Rome not Catholic in Numbers, 235.

Rome not Catholic in Creed, 236.

The Nicene Creed adopted by the early Church. *Manse's Councils* quoted in proof, 237.

Rome added twelve New Articles, and thereby violated a Decree of the Council of Ephesus, which is given, 238.

The Old Creed—The Nicene, 239.

The New Creed—Pope Pius's, 239.

Exclusive Salvation of Rome:—

1. Unreasonable, 240.
2. Unscriptural, 240.

A Manual of Romish Controversy.

CHAPTER I.

The Rule of Faith.—Tradition not the Rule.

FIRST TWO ARTICLES OF THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV.

1st. "I most stedfastly admit and embrace apostolical and ecclesiastical *traditions*, and all other observances and constitutions of the same Church.

2d. "I also admit the Holy Scriptures, according to that sense which our holy mother the Church has held, and does hold, to which it belongs, to *judge* of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures: Neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers."—*Extracted from the* "Ordo Administrandi Sacramenti," p. 65. London, 1831.

THE subject which comes first in order, in the Creed of Pope Pius the Fourth, is the rule of faith.

A Rule of Faith Necessary.—All admit that there must be a rule or measure by which the truth of Christian doctrine may be tried. The Romanist takes one rule, and the Protestant another, and thus the differences between the two parties refer, not only to certain doctrines, but also to the rule itself.

We have, therefore, to inquire, at the very outset, what is that standard of truth, or rule of faith, which has been graciously revealed for the guidance of mankind?

The Romish Rule Theoretically.—The rule of the Church of Rome is Scripture and tradition, and the latter she receives "with equal piety" as the former. By and by, we shall prove that, *practically*, the Romanist, regardless of this rule, submits implicitly to the guidance of his Church, or rather to the Pope as infallible.

The Council of Trent receives,

"With sentiments of equal piety and reverence, all the Books, as well of the Old as of the New Testament, since one God was the author of them both, *and also the traditions relating as well to faith as to morals*, inasmuch as coming either from the mouth of Christ himself, or dictated by the Holy Spirit, they have been preserved, in the Catholic Church, in uninterrupted succession."—*Canons of Trent*, p. 17. Paris, 1832.

Tradition is divided by the Creed of Pope Pius into two kinds,—apostolical, referring to doctrine; and ecclesiastical, referring to ceremonies instituted by the Church. Some Roman Catholic writers distinguish tradition into three kinds,—divine, apostolical, and ecclesiastical.

Divine tradition they consider as that which was delivered by Christ himself; apostolical, as that which the apostles had received by inspiration; and ecclesiastical, as above explained. In the creed, however, and in the Catechism of the Council of Trent, divine tradition is included in apostolical. The following quotation, from the exposition of Bossuet,* will more fully explain the Romish doctrine upon this subject:—

"There remains nothing more but to shew what Catholics believe regarding the Word of God, and the authority of the Church.

"Jesus Christ having laid the foundation of His Church by preaching, the unwritten Word was the first rule of Christianity; and when the writings of the New Testament were added, this unwritten Word did not, upon that account, lose its authority; which makes us receive, with equal veneration, all that was ever taught by the Apostles, whether by writing or by word of mouth, as St Paul himself expresses it."—P. 66, *Expos.* Dub. 1831.

Thus, according to the Church of Rome, there is *an unwritten Word.* The written Word is Scripture; but she maintains that it is insufficient, and therefore she embraces tradition, meaning thereby the teaching of the Apostles, which has not been committed to writing. Tradition is called unwritten, because, as her advocates say, it was not written by the Apostles themselves, though it was afterwards committed to writing by the Fathers, or ancient Christian writers. Such tradition, they add, was *oral*, when first given.

* The well-known Roman Bishop of Meaux, and exponent of Romish doctrine.

Romish Rule Practically.—As if, however, this rule of faith were insufficient, the Church of Rome requires her members to submit to the teaching of the Pope, which is considered as infallible. (See Appendix 3.)

Not content with adding tradition to Scripture, she adds the decrees of the Pope to both, and declares that such decrees are infallible.

Dr Milner says,—

"*Besides* the rule itself, He (Christ) has provided in His holy Church a living, speaking judge to watch over it, and explain it in all matters of controversy."—P. 32, *End of Contr.* Lond. 1841.

Hence the Romanist in his creed professes to admit the Scriptures, according to the "*sense*" of the Church, and "the unanimous consent of the Fathers." It will shortly appear, as we proceed with the subject, that the Romanist receives as *his* rule, not Scripture, nor even Scripture and tradition conjointly, but the decrees of certain Councils, or of the Pope, which he chooses to call "*the* Church." We now, however, consider the theory of the question, and we shall therefore inquire whether tradition can be regarded as the Word of God.

The question between the Church of Rome and the Reformed Church is not, whether the Word of God is the rule, but *what* is to be regarded as the Word of God? Could the Church of Rome prove that her tradition *is* divine, Protestants would at once bow to its authority; but we believe that the Bible, which is admitted to be the Divine Word, is the only certain, because the only inspired record of what Christ and His Apostles taught, and therefore the only rule of faith. Let us, however, see what the Romanist has to advance in favour of tradition.

Romish Arguments.—1. Bellarmine* argues that Scripture is not necessary, from the fact that before the Mosaic age, there was no written rule of faith. This, however, when the result is considered, may be adduced as an argument against tradition, for it is written in reference to the days of Noah, "And God looked upon the

* An eminent Cardinal, and great controversialist and exponent of Romish doctrine.

"earth, and, behold, it was corrupt: for *all flesh had cor-*
"*rupted his way upon the earth,*" Genesis vi. 12. Besides, there was no such need of a written law then, as now. The lives of Adam and Methuselah occupied a space of 1650 years, which rendered the transmission of the precepts of religion, which were then but few, comparatively secure; but, notwithstanding, how lamentable was the result!

2. Some passages of Scripture are quoted by Romanists in support of this dogma. The following text is referred to, (in conjunction with John xxi. 25):—"And many "other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his dis-"ciples, which are not written in this book," John xx. 30. We do not deny that much of what Jesus did is not written, but we maintain, that *what is written is sufficient;* for the next verse declares, "But these are written, that "ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of "God; and that believing ye might have life through "his name," John xx. 31.*

3. Again, they refer to John xvi. 12, "I have yet many "things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." This passage only proves, that, *before* the resurrection, the disciples were not fully instructed in all the truths of the Gospel. On the day of Pentecost, the Holy Spirit was poured out upon the disciples, who were then guided into all truth according to the promise given in John xvi. 13. This text does not set aside the Protestant doctrine, that the Bible contains all that is necessary to salvation.

4. So also are the following texts quoted:—"Now I "praise you, brethren, that ye remember me in all "things, and keep the ordinances," 1 Cor. xi. 2. This passage does not prove that what was so delivered by the Apostle, in so far as it was necessary, was not written.

5. "And the rest will I set in order when I come," 1 Cor. xi. 34. This refers to discipline. We believe

* Even Cardinal Bellarmine says:—"These things being noted, I say that all things were written by the Apostles which are necessary for all, and which they themselves openly preached in common to all."—C. ii. lib. iv *De Verbo Dei.* Inglos. 1590.

that all that is necessary to the good order of the Church is contained in the Bible.

6. "Stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have "been taught, whether by word, or our epistle," 2 Thess. ii. 15. We do not deny that what is contained in Scripture was first taught by word; but we believe that all of what was necessary to salvation, in the teaching of Christ and His Apostles, is committed to writing by inspiration of the Spirit. Were the Apostles now alive, we should receive with equal veneration their word, whether delivered orally, or by writing. If the Church of Rome can only prove that her traditions are apostolic, we shall receive them; *but this she cannot do.* The Bible alone contains what the Apostles taught.

7. The exhortations to Timothy to "keep that which "was committed to his trust," 1 Tim. vi. 20; and to "Hold fast the form of sound words," 2 Tim. i. 13, are also quoted; but they only prove the necessity of adhering to the teaching of the Apostles, which no Protestant denies. They do not affect our belief, that the Bible is the only certain record of that teaching.

8. "I had many things to write, but I will not with ink "and pen write unto thee: But I trust I shall shortly see "thee, and we shall speak face to face," 3 John 13, 14. Can the Romanist prove that the things not written in this epistle, are not written in *other* portions of Scripture? Who denies that there were many things said and done, both by Christ and His Apostles, which are not written? —for "the world itself could not contain the books that "should be written," John xxi. 25. We have the certain warrant of inspiration for believing that sufficient is recorded in the Bible; for St John says, "But *these are* "*written*, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, "the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life "through his name," John xx. 31. Let Rome produce her *apostolical* traditions, and we shall receive them.

Tradition not the Rule.

We now proceed to give our reasons against tradition.

1. Oral Tradition Untrustworthy.—Tradition, according to the Romish scheme, was first *oral*, though afterwards committed to writing in the works of the Fathers. The early Christians wrote but little, on account of the persecution to which they were exposed. And what is found in the writings of the Fathers of the second and third centuries, has little reference to doctrines disputed between Protestants and Roman Catholics. Tradition, therefore, for hundreds of years, was committed to mere *report;* and this it is which Rome receives with equal reverence as the *written* Word. So uncertain is report, that it has become even a proverb, "that a story never "loses in its carriage;" or, in other words, that it seldom retains its original character without addition. We have a remarkable instance in the Bible, in which report or tradition circulated a falsehood,—"Jesus saith unto Him, "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? "follow thou me. Then went this saying abroad among "the brethren, that that disciple should not die: yet Jesus "said not unto him, He shall not die; but if I will that "he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" John xxi. 22, 23. Surely we cannot build our faith on such an insecure foundation as this!

2. The Fathers Contradict each other.—The Fathers whose writings, and the Councils whose decrees, are supposed to contain such an important universal tradition, far from giving a unanimous consent to Romish doctrine, scarcely consent in *any* doctrine. They have decidedly contradicted each other, and even themselves. The Fathers of the second century held the personal reign of Christ; those of the fourth century condemned that doctrine as heresy. The Fathers, on several points, are opposed to Romanism. They condemn the use and worship of images (at least the early Fathers).* They deny the

* "Wherefore there is no doubt but that there is no religion wherever there is an image. For if religion consists in divine

canonicity of the Apocrypha.* They advocate the reading and free use of Scripture;† and even Gregory the Great, Bishop of Rome (if he can be called a Father), denounced the assumption of Universal Bishop as antichristian.‡ Where, then, is the universal tradition and unanimous consent of Fathers to Papal doctrine?

3. Romish Rule Inaccessible.—Observe the difficulties connected with the Romish rule; *it is not accessible to all.* No Roman Catholic has the rule of his faith, who has not all the numerous and ponderous volumes written by the Fathers, and all the acts of councils. The careful

things, and there is nothing divine but in heavenly things, images, therefore, are without religion, for there can be nothing heavenly in that which is earthly."—Lactantius, Lib. ii. *de Orig. Erroris*, p. 185, tom. i. Paris, 1748.

* "But you must know that there are other books, which are not canonical, but were called by the ancients ecclesiastical, that is to say, the book of Wisdom, which is said to be Solomon's, and, the other Wisdom, which is said to be the Son of Sirach's, which book is called by the Latins by the general name of Ecclesiasticus, by which name not the author of the book, but the nature of the writing is declared. Of the same class is the book of Tobit, and Judith, and the book of Maccabees. And in the New Testament the book of the Shepherd, or Hermes, which is called the Two Roads, or the Judgment of Peter; all of which they have thought fit to be read in the churches, but not to be brought forward for the confirmation of the faith."—Jerome, *Sym. Ruff.*, p. 186, tom. ix. Paris, 1602.

† "And this I always exhort, and will not cease to exhort, that you not only attend to the things which are there spoken, but that also when you are at home you diligently apply to the reading of the Holy Scriptures, and this I have never ceased continually to inculcate upon those who are with me in private. And let no one repeat to me those stale and most reprehensible words, I am engaged in the Forum, I transact city business, I follow a trade, I have a wife, I support children, I govern a household, I am a man engaged in the things of this life, it is not for me to read the Scriptures, but for those who have renounced those things, who have taken possession of the tops of the mountains, and constantly lead that sort of life. What sayest thou, O man? Is it not your business to study the Scriptures because you are distracted by a thousand cares? It is much more your business than theirs. For they do not so much need assistance from the Holy Scriptures as those who are involved in multifarious business."—Chrysostom, *De Lazaro, Concio III.*, p. 55, tom. v. Mogunt. 1701.

‡ "I say confidently, whoever calls himself, or desires to be called, the Universal Bishop, in the pride of his heart, is the forerunner of Antichrist."—Gregory, *Registr. Epist.* lib. vii. Ind. 15, epist. 33, ed. Bened. Paris, 1705.

reading of the Fathers occupied, it is said, Archbishop Usher twenty years! No Roman Catholic has examined his rule of faith, who has not waded through Patristic theology. In order to make any use of this rule, he must be acquainted with dead languages, and possess a considerable sum of money to purchase a library of ancient books.

4. Scripture and Human Tradition.—Tradition is condemned by Christ,—"But he answered and said unto "them, Why do ye also transgress the commandment of "God by *your tradition?*" "Thus have ye made the "commandment of God of none effect by your tradition." "But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines "the commandments of men," Matt. xv. 3, 6, 9. The Jews had added certain traditions to the written law; but that addition is censured by the Son of God.

The Apostle says, "Beware lest any man spoil you "through philosophy and vain deceit, after *the tradition* "*of men*, after the rudiments of the world, and not after "Christ," Coloss. ii. 8.

Rome may call her traditions Divine and Apostolical, but she cannot prove them to be such. They are "the "traditions of men," and so fall under the condemnation of Christ. By and by we shall prove that the Bible is the only rule, and every argument which shall be adduced in support of that statement, may be regarded as evidence against tradition.

Questions and Answers.

1. *Q.*—What is the rule of faith of the Church of Rome?

A.—Scripture and tradition.

2. *Q.*—Does she practically allow her members to follow this rule?

A.—No. Practically they form their faith according to the decrees of Popes, or of Councils sanctioned by the Pope

3. *Q.*—And what is meant by the Church in that case?

A.—An ecclesiastical assembly, such as that of Trent, composed of a few bishops; so that the rule of faith to the Romanist is not even tradition and Scripture, but in

reality, the decision of the Pope, or of some clergymen assembled in Council sanctioned by the Pope.

4. *Q.*—Mention, in general, what is the argument which they profess to take from the Bible in favour of tradition.

A.—They quote some passages, in which it is stated that all that Christ and His Apostles taught and did, is not written.

5. *Q.*—How do you answer this?

A.—By showing that the Bible contains all necessary truth. Nothing can be plainer than the declaration in John xx. 31.

6. *Q.*—Why do you reject tradition as a Divine rule?

A.—For many reasons:—1. Rome cannot prove that tradition, handed down in the works of the Fathers, is Divine. 2. Tradition at first, at all events, was *oral.* Who can trust to report? 3. The Fathers, far from handing down a unanimous tradition, contradicted each other, and themselves. 4. The Fathers, on many points, are opposed to Romanism. 5. But few Romanists have access to such an extended rule. It is absolutely *inaccessible* to the unlearned. 6. Tradition is condemned in the Word of God. 7. Even Rome is practically afraid to trust her members to tradition; for she superadds *her own* decrees, and requires them to be received on pain of damnation.

CHAPTER II.

The Rule of Faith.—The Church not the Rule.

(PART FIRST.)

FIRST TWO ARTICLES OF THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV.

1st. "I most stedfastly admit and embrace apostolical and ecclesiastical *traditions*, and all other observances and constitutions of the same Church.

2d. "I also admit the Holy Scriptures, according to that sense which our holy mother the Church has held, and does hold, to

which it belongs, to *judge* of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures: Neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers."—*Extracted from the* "Ordo Administrandi Sacramenti," p. 65. London, 1831.

We have seen, that the rule of faith which Rome professes to adopt, is Scripture and tradition. She, however, adds the authority of the Church to both; and thus practically, the rule which she imposes upon her children, is the teaching of the Church, or, in other words, the dogmas of the Pope, or of Councils sanctioned by the Pope. She does not allow her members to take Scripture and tradition as their guide; for, distrustful, as it were, of her own imposed rule, she requires that they, abandoning the exercise of their own judgment, shall receive the Pope's definitions as the truth contained in Scripture and tradition. Thus practically the Romanist renders implicit obedience to the Pope, and knows no other rule.

Romish Assumptions.—Let us inquire, in the first place, what she means by *the* Church, which possesses this supreme and unerring authority. 1. It is not the Church composed of all who profess and call themselves Christians. 2. It is not the Church of the Orthodox, or those who receive the doctrine of the Trinity; for that, too, would include the Protestant community. 3. It is not even the Church which acknowledges the episcopal form of government; for that would embrace the heretical English, as well as the schismatical Greek Church;—but it is those only in communion with Rome. Thus she employs the word Church in a sense of her own, and denies the Christianity of all other Churches.

Where is Infallibility?—We now ask, Where is this infallible authority lodged? Here Romanists are divided in sentiment. Some say, that the Church diffusive, composed of all its members, whether lay or clerical, is infallible; others maintain, that the Pope, when speaking *ex cathedra*, or officially, is infallible; while others assert, that councils possess that authority; and others, again, assume that councils, with the Pope at their head, are the only unerring judge. This difference of opinion

we shall notice by and by. Again, the Church, which is supposed to possess infallibility, is still further narrowed. It means the council (miscalled general) in which clergymen of certain orders and offices meet together. And thus the Church to which the attribute of infallibility is said to belong, is the Assembly of a few bishops and clergy, with the Pope at their head! [The infallibility of the Pope has been defined.]

Romish Arguments for Infallibility.

Before we prove that this is not an infallible guide, let us notice some of the arguments which are adduced in its favour:—

I. They say, that as there are temporal judges, to whom belongs the exposition of civil laws, so there ought to be a supreme spiritual judge on earth to determine infallibly points of faith and manners. To this we reply,—

1. That we have no right to consider what *ought* to be, but what *is* provided by the Divine Being for the instruction of mankind. Similar is the argument of the deist, who says, that if God had given a revelation of His will, it would have been written in the skies, and irresistible in its evidence. Ably has it been shown by Bishop Butler, Paley, and others, that such irresistible evidence would not accord with that probationary state in which man is called upon to exercise patience and faith.

2. There is no parallel between the two. The secular judge can produce his credentials. His authority is indisputable, else his decisions would be of no avail, and would give rise to nothing but discord and division. The Church of Rome, far from producing such undoubted credentials, answers the characteristics of the apostasy foretold in the Word of God. Rome, by her unauthorised claim to a supremacy over all churches and consciences, is the great cause of disunion in the professing Christian Church.

3. Her infallible power, so far as the exposition of Scripture is concerned, is of no practical utility; for she has never yet given an authorised, and much less an infallible exposition of even one chapter of the Bible. The

ministers of any denomination can easily meet together, and lay claim to infallibility. The Mormonites and Romanists do this; but why do they not establish their claim, and at once put an end to all dispute, by giving such a commentary of the Bible as will, when submitted to examination, prove infallible?

4. In temporal causes, the judges have no interest in the suit, and may therefore be impartial. In the great cause between Protestants and Romanists, the question relates to the authority of the Pope and his clergy; and yet, forsooth, according to the Romish doctrine, the Pope and his bishops, assembled in council, should be the final judge of the controversy! Protestants protest against the decisions of Pope and councils, on the ground that they are *parties interested in the case.* This argument is unanswerable.

5. Temporal courts have reference to temporal and finite matters, and the decisions of the judge, though final, are not infallible; but the concerns of religion are spiritual, and mainly relate to another world. Hence it is, that in religion the only infallible *Judge* of truth is God—the Judge of all.

II. It is argued, that without the authority of the Church we cannot prove the genuineness, authenticity, and inspiration of the Bible. We answer, that such an argument is infidel in its character; for if the assertion of a certain number of clergymen assembled in council, be our only authority for Scripture, the truth of the Bible rests upon a sandy foundation. As well might the Mahometan attempt to prove the divine origin of the Koran by the authority of a council of Mahometan priests! We prove the genuineness, authenticity, and inspiration of the Bible by *evidence;* and it is to evidence that the Roman Catholic missionary in heathen lands, must himself appeal. The following conversation may be supposed to take place between a Romish priest and a heathen:—

The Heathen says,—You tell me that the Scriptures are the book of God; and you call on me to receive cer-

tain doctrines contained in Scripture and tradition. Pray, how am I to know that the Scriptures are inspired?

Romish Priest.—By the authority of the Church, which is infallible.

Heathen.—I know nothing of your Church. How prove you her infallibility and authority?

Priest.—By Scripture.

Heathen.—And so you prove the Church by Scripture, and Scripture by the Church, which is most absurd. You make the foundation to sustain the structure, and the structure again to sustain the foundation. I know nothing of Scripture, the Church, or tradition. You must prove your assertion by independent authority—by evidence—or I never can become a Christian. I have no desire to give up my own religion, at the mere bidding of another.

The Roman missionary can never convince the heathen by the authority of the Church. Now, either Scripture can be proved by evidence, or it cannot. If it cannot, no heathen, and indeed no rational man, can be expected to receive its authority. If it can, the Romish theory falls to the ground.

III. They argue, from the alleged inconvenience of private judgment, for the necessity of an infallible tribunal upon earth; and they appeal to the fact, that many denominations exist amongst Protestants. To this we reply,—

1. That the pretension to infallibility, as made by the Church of Rome, can never remedy the alleged evil. If she could produce infallible credentials for her infallibility, we admit that there would be no need of private judgment, and that all difficulty would cease. But what infallible authority has declared that she is infallible? None; for Romanists themselves, after all, are constrained to appeal to private judgment, in order to establish the claims of their Church. Bellarmine gives fifteen marks or notes of the Church; and by an appeal to each, and an extensive argument, he endeavours to prove that Rome is the true infallible communion. These marks involve an examination of Christian

doctrine, and the exercise of private judgment. And thus the Church, after all, is based upon such judgment, to which the appeal must necessarily be made. Is the Romanist, with all his pretensions to infallibility, more certain of the truth of Christianity than the Protestant? If God had either declared, that certain Roman clergymen in council are an infallible guide, or rendered each man infallible in his own opinion, there had been no need of private judgment.

2. The alleged inconvenience has not been remedied in the Church of Rome. There is, no doubt, a certain degree of *external* uniformity in that Church, such as might be presented by any denomination; but there is not, we maintain, a unity of opinion. Rome has ever been the great parent of schism. By her unhallowed pretensions, she is the main cause of division existing in the professing Church. Sometimes there were three Popes laying claim to the Papal chair, and hurling their anathemas at each other.* Schisms in the Papacy have

* The Council of Pisa, A.D. 1409, passed the following decree against the two reigning popes:—"And that the aforesaid Angelo Corrario and Peter de Luna, the competitors for the popedom, and each of them, have been, and are notorious schismatics, and the supporters, defenders, favourers, and approvers of the old schism, obstinate and notorious heretics, moreover, and wanderers from the faith, entangled in the enormous and infamous crimes of perjury and violation of promise, openly scandalizing the holy Church universal of God, with notorious, evident, and manifest incorrigibility, contumacy, and pertinacity; and from these, and other causes, have rendered themselves utterly unworthy of the honour and dignity of the Popedom; and that they and neither of them shall, on account of the aforesaid offences, crimes, and excesses, rule, or reign, or preside over the Church, but shall ever be cut off from her communion."—*Sess.* xv. p. 402. *Manse's Con.* Venice, 1754.

The Council elected Alexander V. in their stead; but the result we learn from the following passage in the work of a Roman Catholic historian:—"The Council of Pisa being terminated, whilst all were exulting, and whilst the Cardinals and the Council considered that they had admirably consulted for the dignity of the Church, and had restored health to the Church, *that schism, which was thought to be extinct, sprang up again worse than before,* or, to speak correctly, it did not grow again; but whereas it was concealed, as a hidden fire, it suddenly broke out with increased violence, and created a greater conflagration. For since Gregory and Benedict *refused to obey the Council, and to relinquish the Pope-*

lasted for many years. Councils have contradicted councils. To this very day, there is scarcely a text of Scripture relating to doctrine, upon the full meaning of which Romish commentators agree. Doctors have opposed doctors, and the Church of one age has contradicted the Church of another. The history of the Papacy has been one, not only of crime and bloodshed, but also of discord and schism.

3. This objection might be urged against the apostolic and primitive Church. There were divisions even when the Apostles lived; for one said, "I am of Paul, and I "of Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I of Christ," 1 Cor. i. 12. Augustine* reckons about eighty heresies which existed in the early Church, and a variety of opinion prevailed even amongst the orthodox, (though few and simple were the articles of their faith), not only in reference to Scripture interpretation, but as to the doctrine of the personal reign, and other points.

IV. In proof of Papal infallibility, some texts of Scripture are quoted:—

Matt. 16. 18. And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. V 19. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven.

When considering the Papal supremacy, we shall show, with the Divine blessing, that Peter was not the rock, and that, *a fortiori*, the Pope is not the rock. But what has this passage to do with the dogma, that certain Roman clergymen in council, convened by the Pope, are infallible? Is there one word in the text about Pope, or Council, or Roman Church? No. That Church was not then in existence; and it was "in Antioch," "that "the disciples were first called Christians," Acts xi. 26.

dom, it became a subject of dispute whether the Council of Pisa *could* condemn them, especially since one or other of them was the true Pope, although which it was, was not quite manifest to everybody. Therefore, whereas this schism in the beginning had only *two heads*, and the Council was anxious to cut them *both* off, all at once *three* were in existence at the same time."—*Bzovius Annals*, A.D. 1411.

* The well-known Bishop of Hippo, who lived in the fifth century.

The Church which is built upon the rock, is the Church composed of God's redeemed people (not the Roman Church, but, as the Saviour says, "*my* Church,")—the Church "holy and without blemish," which is washed in the blood of the Lamb. The gates of hell can never prevail against the Church of the faithful. It will withstand the shock of persecution and the storms of time.

The expositions of Roman theologians of this passage, afford a remarkable instance of division in an infallible community. Liguori,* Bonaventure,† and others, teach that the Pope is infallible. Alphonsus a Castro,‡ and a host of divines, especially of the French Church, deny this doctrine. (See p. 35.)

Liguori argues to this effect: If the rock—the Pope—be not infallible, the Church built thereon may fall:—a fair inference.—(*Mor. Theol.* tom. i., p. 125. Venice, 1828.) But the Pope is not infallible, say the French divines, and others, (Dupin, Alphonsus a Castro, &c.) Therefore the Church may fall.

Thus this very text, viewed in connection with the opposing opinions of Romish divines, disproves the infallibility of the Church. Where now is the infallible sense of Scripture? Where is even the authorised comment of Rome on this one text? Echo answers, Where?

Romish expositors have split upon the very rock of the Church.§

* A saint canonized in 1839. † A canonized saint.

‡ Chaplain to Philip of Spain, the husband of Mary Queen of England.

§ The difference of opinion which existed between Romish theologians as to the infallibility of the Pope, will be seen in the following contrast between Cardinal Bellarmine on the one hand, and Alphonsus a Castro, Lyra, and Gerson on the other:—

Cardinal Bellarmine says:—"It is probable that the Pope, not only as a Pope, *cannot err*, but as a private man, *cannot fall into heresy*, nor hold any obstinate opinion contrary to the faith."—*Bellarmine de Rom. Pont.*, lib. iv. c. 6. sect. 1. Prag. 1721.

Alphonsus a Castro says:—"We doubt not whether one may be a Pope and a heretic together; for I believe that there is none so shameless a flatterer of the Pope, that he will grant him that prerogative that he cannot err, nor be deceived in expounding the Scriptures, seeing it is well known that divers Popes have been so palpably unlearned, that they have been utterly ignorant of

2. The declaration of our Lord is also quoted,—

Matt. 28. 20. Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.

But again we ask, What has this to do with the dogma, that certain Papal clergy in council are infallible? Is there one word about Pope or council in the text?

This promise is connected with a condition,—"Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and, lo," &c. Rome has not fulfilled the condition, and therefore she cannot claim the promise. This is no promise of infallibility. Christ is *with* His people individually, John xiv. 23; are individual Christians, therefore, infallible?

3. Again, Matt. xviii. 15, 16, 17, is quoted,—

Matt. 18. 15. Moreover, if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: *if he shall hear thee*, thou hast gained thy brother. V 16. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. V 17. And if he shall neglect *to hear them*, tell it unto the church: but if *he neglect to hear the church*, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican.

This surely cannot prove the infallibility of the Church. It is the duty of the offending brother to hear him whom he had offended; but that will not prove the *offended brother* infallible. It is his duty likewise to hear the two or three witnesses, but that will not prove *them* infallible. It is his duty to hear the Church, but by a parity of reasoning, that will not prove the *Church* infallible, no more than it will the offended brother, or the two or three witnesses. The blessed Jesus refers to a quarrel between two members of a church.* In the

---

their grammar, and therefore, how can they be able to expound the Scriptures?"—Lib. i. c. 4.

Lyra says:—"*Many* Princes and *Popes* have proved *apostates*, and *strayed* from the faith."

Gerson says:—"Every one of *whatsoever degree* in the Church, *although he be Pope* himself, is compassed with infirmity, and subject to error, and is in possibility of deceiving and being deceived."—P. 8, tom. 1. Anto. 1706.

In fact, a *Pope himself*, Adrian IV., has admitted that *Popes are fallible*.

* The original word which is translated church, might be rendered, and in this instance strictly means, *the congregation*.

first instance, they should endeavour to settle the dispute between themselves; but if that fail, two or three Christian brethren are to be called in as witnesses; and if their mediation fail, the whole congregation or church is to be informed; and if all these means prove unavailing, the offender is to be excluded from Church communion. How can this establish the right of certain Popish bishops to pass decrees infallibly, in reference to doctrine? The Papal tribunal dares not to decide upon the dispute between Saint Liguori, and others, as to the rock of the Church. (The point was defined in 1870.)

4. Again, 1 Tim. iii. 15 is quoted,—

1 Tim. 3. 15. But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.

Such is the designation of the Church of Ephesus,* and such may every Christian Church be called.

It was the practice to expose proclamations on pillars. The Christian Church proclaims the Gospel. It is "the "pillar of the truth," and supports the Gospel (under God) in the world, and thus is "the ground of the truth."

But was the Church of Ephesus, though so designated, infallible? Hear what God says of that very Church,—

Rev. 2. 5. Remember therefore from whence thou art *fallen*, and repent, and do the first works; or else I will come unto thee quickly, *and will remove thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent.*

5. The promises in the Old Testament which relate to the universality and blessedness of the Church, are quoted by Rome. But here again is her fallacy. She takes it for granted that *she* is the Church. We ask, Was she ever yet *universal*, either in the world or in Christendom? Have the nations beaten their swords into ploughshares, and spears into pruning-hooks? No; and therefore these prophecies yet remain to be fulfilled in the millennium. Rome, wherever and whenever ascendant, has proved herself to be the prolific source of ignorance, vice, bloodshed, and woe.

* Timothy was Bishop of the Church of Ephesus.

Questions and Answers.

1. *Q.*—What is practically the Church, which Romanists suppose to be infallible?

A.—The Pope, or the assembly of certain bishops, commonly called a Council, sanctioned by the Pope.

2. *Q.*—How do they argue in favour of infallibility?

A.—They say, that as there are temporal, so there ought to be spiritual courts.

3. *Q.*—How do you answer this?

A.—By showing, 1. That we have no right to consider, in reference to revelation, what *ought* to be, but what *is*. 2. That temporal judges can produce their credentials, which the Papal cannot do. 3. That the Papal tribunal is useless, so far as the exposition of Scripture is concerned, for it has never given an infallible sense of one chapter of the Bible. 4. That Papal judges are *interested*, and therefore not *impartial*. 5. That God is the judge in religion, which relates to another world as well as this.

4. *Q.*—How do you answer their assertion, that we cannot prove Scripture but by Church authority?

A.—By denying the assertion, for we can prove the Bible to be true by evidence; and by showing that the authority of the Church would go for nothing in evidence, for it would be like a man bearing witness in his own favour.

5. *Q.*—How do you answer their argument as to the alleged inconvenience resulting from private judgment?

A.—By showing that Papal infallibility does not obviate that inconvenience; for Romanists themselves appeal to private judgment to establish the claims of their Church, else they could not reason at all.

6. *Q.*—Are the differences which exist among Protestants, a ground of objection to Protestantism?

A.—No; for there are important differences amongst Romanists themselves: and if this were a valid objection against Protestantism, it would be equally valid against primitive Christianity, for there were differences among primitive Christians.

7. *Q.*—How do you show that the texts which Romanists quote in favour of their infallibility do not prove the point?

A.—By showing, 1. That they do not prove the infallibility of any Church, much less of an assembly of Papal bishops. 2. The Church, against which the gates of hell cannot prevail, is the Church of believers, built on Christ. 3. The Pope, as the rock, until 1870, was confessed to be fallible by many Romish divines. *How can an infallible Church rest upon a fallible rock?* 4. Christ is with His people always. This will not prove them infallible. Rome has no claim to this promise, Matt. xxviii. 20, for she has not fulfilled the annexed condition. 5. It was the duty of the offending brother to *hear* the offended, or the one or two witnesses, or the whole congregation or church; but as that duty will not prove the offended brother to be infallible, nor the one or two witnesses, so neither will it prove the Church. 6. The Church of Ephesus, as holding forth the truth, and supporting it in the world, was the "pillar and ground of the truth;" but it was not infallible, for the Saviour declares that she had "*fallen*," Rev. ii. 5. 7. The predictions in the Old Testament, relating to the universality and blessedness of Christ's religion, have not yet been fulfilled. The swords are not yet beaten into ploughshares. Rome was never *universal;* and instead of being the fount of blessedness, she is a source of woe.

CHAPTER III.

The Rule of Faith.—The Church not the Rule.

(PART SECOND.)

FIRST TWO ARTICLES OF THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV.

1st. "I most stedfastly admit and embrace apostolical and ecclesiastical *traditions*, and all other observances and constitutions of the same Church.

2d. "I also admit the Holy Scriptures, according to that sense

which our holy mother the Church has held, and does hold, to which it belongs, to *judge* of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures; Neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers."—*Extracted from the* "Ordo Administrandi Sacramenti," p. 65. London, 1831.

THE real question between Romanists and Protestants on this point is simply, Whether decrees of the Pope, or of a certain number of ecclesiastics with the Pope at their head, are to be received as infallible? On some occasions at the Council of Trent, there were not more than fifty bishops present. We should not allow the Church of Rome to occupy vantage-ground, by permitting her advocates to boast of the authority of the Catholic Church, without calling upon them to define what that Church is, and requiring them to acknowledge, that its high sounding authority consists in the decrees of Popes, or Councils with the Pope. To Popes, therefore, we must specially direct attention; and if we prove their fallibility, we prove the fallibility of the Church of Rome.

I. Romish Infallibility Rests on a Fallible Foundation.—We argue that Popes and councils are destitute of authority for their claim to infallibility. The foundation must be such as will sustain the structure, and therefore an infallible Church would need an infallible foundation. Now, what infallible being or authority has declared that Popes are infallible? Mormonites * on the one hand, and Romanists on the other, say that they are infallible. Has a voice from heaven, amid these opposing claims, pronounced which is infallible? The doctrine of infallibility cannot be established with any show of reason, unless it can be proved that an infallible *independent* authority (independent, we say, because the testimony of a Church in her own favour will go for nothing in evidence) has declared, 1. That the Church is infallible; 2. That Rome is the Church;

* A sect lately arisen in America, which professes to have found another Bible, and which, in addition to many blasphemies, practises polygamy.

3. That such infallibility is lodged in the Pope, or Councils sanctioned by the Pope; 4. That Councils should be composed of certain ecclesiastical officers, and that such only have a right to vote; 5. That a certain majority is sufficient for the enactment of a law; 6. That even fifty or sixty bishops may be infallible in their decrees. All these points, and many more, would need to be fixed; and as Rome repudiates private judgment, *they* should not be left to the settlement of individuals as they may think best. Some would say, and with great truth, that the laity have as much right to vote in council as the clergy. Others might think it strange that certain ecclesiastical orders should be excluded from the vote; for surely infallibility cannot be supposed to be attached more peculiarly to a bishop, though an impious and immoral man, than to a deacon, pious and learned. Others, again, think that a majority would not suffice to render a decree valid, but that unanimity ought to be the result of an assembly which professes to possess the plenary inspiration of the Holy Ghost.

We challenge the Roman Catholic world to prove, that any infallible authority has declared that Popes are infallible, or settled any of these points. The Papal structure is mighty in its dimensions; but Papal infallibility is altogether ideal, being without foundation in Scripture, reason, or truth.

II. Rome in a Mist as to the Locality of her Infallibility.—The Papal Church cannot tell positively where its infallibility does or does not reside,—whether in the Church diffusive, or in Councils alone, or in the Pope, or in Councils with the Pope at their head.* Roman Catholics generally, say that Councils with the

* This uncertainty and difference of sentiment as to where infallibility is lodged, is admitted and avowed by Charles Butler, the well-known Roman Catholic advocate, in his *Book of the Roman Catholic Church*. He says,—

"In spiritual concerns, the *Transalpine* opinions ascribe to the Pope a superiority and controlling power over the whole Church, should she chance to oppose his decrees, and consequently over a general Council, his representative. . . . . .

"They likewise ascribe to the Pope the extraordinary preroga-

Pope are infallible, but here is another insuperable difficulty. Cases may occur in which the concurrence of the Pope with the Council is impossible,—1. If there be two or more Popes at one time, as the case was for many years. 2. If the Pope be suspected of heresy. 3. If the question to be decided relates to the reformation of the Church in its *head* and members. 4. If doubts be raised as to the validity of Papal election. Bellarmine gives these four amongst other causes for the assembling of a General Council. In these cases, the concurrence of the Pope cannot be obtained. Is the Council, we ask, infallible in such a case, without a Pope? Some answer, No; some, Yes; and all is doubt and uncertainty on this fundamental point in an infallible Church! [The infallibility of the Pope has been defined.]

III. Romish Councils not General.—According to Romish doctrine, Councils, in order to possess binding authority as infallible, should be œcumenical or general;

---

tive of *personal infallibility*, when he undertakes to issue a solemn decision on any point of faith.

"The *Cisalpines*" (another party) "affirm, that in spirituals the Pope is subject, in doctrine and discipline, to the Church, and to a general Council representing her.

"They affirm, that a general Council may *without*, and even against the Pope's consent, reform the Church.

"They deny his personal infallibility, and hold that he may be deposed by the Church, or a general Council, for heresy and schism."—*Letter* x. p. 122.

Cardinal Bellarmine admits the fallibility of Councils in the following passage:—

"*Thirdly*, A Council without a Pope may err even *in decrees of faith*, as appears in the Council of Sirmium, to which Hosius subscribed; also in the Councils of Milan, Rimini, Ephesus, Constantinople under Justinian II., Constantinople under Leo the Isaurian, and another under Constantine Copronymus. But a Council with a Pope cannot err; therefore a Council without a Pope cannot do all those things that a Council with a Pope can do. Nor can it be replied, that those Councils erred because they were not lawful; for to most of them nothing was wanting but the Pope's assent. The Second Council of Ephesus, moreover, was precisely similar to the Council of Basil; each was called by a Pope, the Pope's legate was present at the opening of each of them,—the Pope's legate shortly after withdrew from each of them,—the Pope was excommunicated in each of them;—all of which things, respecting the Council of Basil, appear in its acts, as related by

that is to say, should represent the whole Church. Tried by this rule, Rome fails. The last Councils, which establish the peculiar doctrines of the Papacy, have no claim to be called general. The first four Councils,—Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, with some degree of justice, may pretend to the title, because representatives from the whole Church—the *Oriental* or Greek, as well as *Western*—met together: and, by the by, the Orientals were nearly a hundred to one of the Westerns. But in the Council of Trent, and in the preceding synods which established Papal dogmas, not one representative of the Oriental or Greek Church was present.* They must, therefore, be regarded as Papal cabals, composed of the Pope's creatures, who were determined for the most part to carry out his views. What Romanist, if he be reasonable at all, can attach infallibility to such a *clique?*

IV. Councils Contradictory.—Councils have given good evidence of their fallibility, by contradicting each

---

Æneas Sylvius. And what regards the Council of Ephesus, appears in the 12th, 13th, 15th, 21st, and 22d letters of Leo, and in the Council of Chalcedon, Act 3; and, notwithstanding, our adversaries cannot deny that the Council of Ephesus ERRED."—*On the Rom. Pont.* lib. iv. c. 2.

On the other hand, the Council of Constance declares a Council above a Pope.

"This holy Council of Constance, which constitutes a General Council for the extirpation of the aforesaid schism,* and for the Union and Reformation of the Church of God, in her *head* and *members*, lawfully assembled, in the Holy Spirit, to the praise of Almighty God, to bring to pass, more easily, securely, and freely, the Union and Reformation of the Church of God, ordains, defines, decrees, and declares as follows:—

"In the first place, it declares that this Council, lawfully assembled in the Holy Spirit, and constituting a General Council, and representing the Church of Christ, derives its power *directly* from Christ; and that every one, be his condition or dignity what it may, even BE IT THE DIGNITY of the POPE, is bound to obey it in those things which appertain to faith, and the extirpation of the said schism, and the Reformation of the said Church in her head and members."—*Labbe's Councils*, tom. xii. p. 22.

* Unless we except the Council of Florence, where a union took place between the Western and Greek Churches—a union, however, immediately after abolished.

* Schism in the Popedom.

other. A Council at Constantinople decreed that image-worship should be abolished; the Second Council of Nice declared against the decree of Constantinople! The Councils of Frankfort and Elleberis, in their decrees, are opposed to image-worship, and therefore to the Council of Nice. The Council of Ariminum, attended more numerously than even the First Council of Nice, passed decrees in favour of Arianism, though other Councils decidedly condemned that system. The Councils of Constance, Pisa, and Basil, declared that a Council was above a Pope. The Council of Florence and the Fifth Council of Lateran, declared against that doctrine.

V. An Infallible Judge would be Necessary to Settle Infallibly the Differences of Councils.—No infallible authority has decided which of the Councils are infallible, and which not. There were, at the lowest calculation, four hundred Fathers present at the Arian Council of Ariminum; three hundred and thirty at the Council of Constantinople, which anathematized the use and worship of images; a large number likewise at the Council of Constance. We ask, With what degree of certainty can the Romanist reject these Councils, and yet accept the decisions of Trent as infallible, though, on some occasions, there were not more than fifty bishops present? The Romanist needs an *independent* infallible authority to decide amid the claims of opposing Councils. Has a voice from heaven declared that Nice is infallible, and not Ariminum; that the Second of Nice is of authority, and not the Second of Constantinople; that Florence is infallible, and not Basil?

VI. The Primitive Church had no General Council.—If Councils be necessary as an infallible guide, we ask, *What infallible guide had the Christian Church before Councils assembled?* The first Council—the Nicene—took place in the year 325. During three hundred years, how many millions of souls belonged to the Christian Church, and passed to their great account! And we ask, Were they without a "sure anchor of the

soul," because there were no General Councils? Division existed to a great extent even in the second century; and Councils, if needed at all, were needed, especially, then. Was the age which immediately succeeded the Apostles less favoured than the fourth century?

Either General Councils are necessary or not. If they are necessary, the early Church possessed no infallible guide in its purest and best days. If they are not necessary, the Papal dogma of the necessity of an infallible guide, falls to the ground.

VII. Councils have given Evidence of their Fallibility.—Councils have evidenced their fallibility, by requiring belief in doctrines which are palpably false. We instance the dogma of transubstantiation, which is false, if we credit the testimony of our senses, through which, as the channel, all knowledge is derived. If transubstantiation be untrue, the dogma of Papal infallibility is untrue likewise. But our senses disprove transubstantiation, as we shall show more fully by and by, and thus disprove also the notion of infallibility.

VIII. Romish Infallibility Practically Useless.—Such infallibility is practically useless. The Church of Rome has never ventured to give an infallible exposition of Scripture; and notwithstanding all her boast of certainty as to her dogmas, she cannot assure her members that they possess the sacraments, or belong to a Christian Church. In the proper place, we shall show that the doctrine of *intention* carries doubt and uncertainty into the whole Papal system of polity and worship.

IX. The Silence of Scripture Disproves Infallibility.—The very silence of Scripture as to an infallible Church (had we even no express statement against infallibility), would disprove the dogma. The leading characteristic of the Papacy, is her claim to supremacy, authority, and infallibility. This pervades all the works of her champions, as well as her own documents. It is the prominent feature of the system, and the very rallying point of Popery. Can it be that the Church is

infallible, and councils with the Pope at their head, the unerring judge of controversy, and yet the inspired records of Christianity, and writings of the Apostles, be silent upon the subject.

The Apostle does not say, Submit to the Councils and Pope; but he says, "Prove all things; hold fast that "which is good," 1 Thess. v. 21. Another Apostle does not say, Go to the Church, and by her decision in council be led in your religious views; but he says, "Beloved, believe not every spirit, but *try* the spirits "whether they are of God; because many false pro- "phets are gone out into the world," 1 John iv. 1. Is it possible that Councils are the great remedy for all divisions, and yet the Apostles, even when alluding to divisions, neglect to state that fact, which, of all others, would be most important? Chillingworth handles this point so well, that we quote the following passage:—

"In the meantime, give me leave to think it strange, and not far from a prodigy, that this doctrine of the Romish Church's being the guide of faith, if it be true doctrine, should either not be known to the four evangelists, or, if it were known to them, that, being wise and good men, they should either be so envious of the Church's happiness, or so forgetful of the work they took in hand, —which was, to write the gospel of Christ,—as that not so much as one of them should mention, so much as once, this so necessary part of the gospel, without the belief whereof there is no salvation, and with the belief whereof, unless men be snatched away by sudden death, there is hardly any damnation. It is evident they do all of them with one consent speak very plainly of many things of no importance in comparison hereof; and is it credible, or indeed possible, that, with one consent, or rather conspiracy, they should be so deeply silent concerning this *unum necessarium?** You may believe it, if you can; for my part, I cannot, unless I see demonstration for it. For, if you say, 'They send us to the Church, and, consequently, to the Church of Rome;" this is to suppose, that which can never be proved, that the Church of Rome is the only Church; and without this supposal, upon division of the Church, I am as far to seek for a guide of my faith as ever. As for example:—

"In that great division of the Church when the whole world wondered, saith St Jerome, that it was become Arian, when Liberius, bishop of Rome (as St Athanasius and St Hilary testify), subscribed their heresy, and joined in communion with them; or

* "One thing needful."

in the division between the Greek and the Roman Church, about the procession of the Holy Ghost, when either side was the Church to itself, and each part heretical and schismatical to the other; what direction could I then, an ignorant man, have found from that text of Scripture, 'Unless he hear the church, let him be to thee as a heathen or a publican?' or, 'Upon this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it?'

"Again: Give me leave to wonder,

"That neither St Paul, writing to the Romans, should so much as intimate this their privilege of infallibility; but rather, on the contrary, put them in fear, in the eleventh chapter, that they, as well as the Jews, were in danger of falling away:

"That St Peter, the pretended bishop of Rome, writing two catholic epistles, mentioning his departure, should not once acquaint the Christians whom he writes to, what guide they were to follow after he was taken from them:

"That the writers of the New Testament should so frequently forewarn men of heretics, false Christs, false prophets, and not once arm them against them, with letting them know this only sure means of avoiding their danger:

"That so great a part of the New Testament should be employed about Antichrist, and so little, or indeed none at all, about the Vicar of Christ, and the guide of the faithful:

"That our Saviour should leave this only means for the ending of controversies, and yet speak so obscurely and ambiguously of it, that now our judge is the greatest controversy, and the greatest hindrance of ending them:

"That there should be better evidence in the Scripture to entitle the king to this office, who disclaims it, than the pope, who pretends it:

"That St Peter should not ever exercise over the apostles any one act of jurisdiction, nor they ever give him any one title of authority over them:

"That, if the apostles did know St Peter was made head over them when our Saviour said, 'Thou art Peter,' &c., they should still contend who should be the first, and that our Saviour should never tell them St Peter was the man:

"That St Paul should say he was in nothing inferior to the very chief apostles:

"That the catechumenists in the primitive church should never be taught this foundation of their faith,—that the Church of Rome was guide of their faith:

"That the Fathers, Tertullian, St Jerome, and Optatus, when they flew highest in commendation of the Roman Church, should attribute no more to her than to all other apostolical churches:

"That, in the controversy about Easter, the bishops and churches of Asia should be so ill catechised as not to know this principle of Christian religion,—the necessity of conformity in doctrine with the Church of Rome; that they should never be pressed with any such necessity of conformity in all things, but only with the tradition of the western churches in that point:

"That Irenæus, and many other bishops (notwithstanding *ad*

hanc ecclesiam necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam),* should not yet think that a necessary doctrine, nor a sufficient ground of excommunication, which the Church of Rome thought to be so:

"That St Cyprian, and the bishops of Afric, should be so ill instructed in their faith as not to know this foundation of it; that they likewise were never urged with any such necessity of conformity with the Church of Rome, nor never charged with heresy or error for denying it:

"That when Liberius joined in communion with the Arians, and subscribed their heresy, the Arians then should not be the church and the guide of faith:

"That never any heretics, for three ages after Christ, were pressed with this argument of the infallibility of the present Church of Rome, or charged with denial of it, as a distinct heresy, so that Æneas Sylvius should have cause to say, *Ante tempora Concilii Niceni quisque sibi vivebat, et parvus respectus habebatur ad ecclesiam Romanam*:† that the ecclesiastical story of those times mentions no acts of authority of the Church of Rome over other churches; as if there should be a monarchy, and the kings, for some ages together, should exercise no act of jurisdiction in it:

"That, to supply this defect, the Decretal Epistles should be so impudently forged, which, in a manner, speak nothing else but *reges et monarchas* ['kings and monarchs']; I mean, the popes' making laws for exercising authority over all other churches:

"That the African churches in St Austin's time should be ignorant that the pope was head of the Church, and judge of appeals, *jure divino*; and that there was a necessity of conformity with the Church in this and all other points of doctrine:

"Nay, that the popes themselves should be so ignorant of the true ground of this their authority as to pretend to it, not upon scriptural or universal tradition, but upon an imaginary, pretended, non-such canon of the Council of Nice:

"That Vincentius Lirinensis, seeking for a guide of his faith, and a preservative from heresy, should be ignorant of this so ready one,—the infallibility of the Church of Rome."‡—*Relig. Prot., Letter to Lewgar.* Lond. 1845.

X. Romish Infallibility Disproved in Scripture.—The Scriptures plainly disprove the dogma of infallibility. The angels in heaven kept not their first estate,

* "All churches, that is, all men in every part who are believers, must come together to this church."

† "Prior to the time when the Council of Nice was convened, every one lived for himself, and little deference was paid to the Church of Rome."

‡ Chillingworth observes,—"Following the Scripture only, I shall embrace a religion of admirable simplicity, consisting in a manner wholly in the worship of God in spirit and in truth: whereas your church and doctrine is even loaded with an infinity of weak, childish, ridiculous, unsavoury superstitions and ceremonies, and full of that unrighteousness for which Christ shall judge the world."—*Protestants not Heretics*, part i. chap. vi., *ut supra*.

Jude 6. Our first parents by transgression fell, Rom. v. The Seven Churches of Asia were fallible, Rev. ii. iii. The Jewish Church apostatized more than once. Even beneath mount Sinai, with Aaron at its head, it worshipped the golden calves, Exod. xxxii.; and finally, it filled up the measure of its guilt by crucifying the Son of God! The high priest and scribes, in solemn council, rejected the blessed Jesus, Matt. xxvi. 57-68. But what is still more striking, the Apostle warns the Church of Rome by that very example,—

Rom. 11. 18. Boast not against the branches: but if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee. V 19. Thou wilt say then, The branches were broken off, that I might be graffed in. V 20. Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and *thou standest by faith. Be not high-minded, but fear:* V 21. For if God spared not the natural branches, take heed LEST HE ALSO SPARE NOT THEE. V 22. Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity; but towards thee, goodness, IF THOU CONTINUE IN HIS GOODNESS; OTHERWISE THOU ALSO SHALT BE CUT OFF.

Nothing can be more express than this. Here the Apostle warns the Church of Rome by the example of the Jewish Church, and distinctly says, that if she continued not in the goodness of God, she should be "cut off," which is as express as though he had said, Rome, thou art fallible! Beware! If the Church of Rome be fallible, she is not necessarily the centre of unity, and there may be a true Church without communion with her. This quotation might be entitled "the End of Controversy," for it completely disposes of the Romish claim.

Questions and Answers.

1. *Q.*—What is the real question between Romanists and Protestants?

A.—Whether the Pope, or Councils with the Pope at their head, is infallible.

2. *Q.*—How do you disprove Papal infallibility?

A.—By showing, 1. That unless there be an infallible authority for receiving infallibility, it is of no avail;

2. That Romish Councils are not general; 3. That Councils have contradicted each other; 4. That there should be an independent infallible authority to decide between the claims of opposing Councils; 5. That the early Church had no Councils; 6. That Councils have taught what is plainly false.

3. *Q.*—What is Chillingworth's argument on this subject?

A.—It is, that it is impossible that such an infallible Judge could have been appointed without some intimation of the same in Scripture.

4. *Q.*—Are Romish Councils general?

A.—No. Those which establish Papal dogmas, are composed only of Papal ecclesiastics.

5. *Q.*—Mention some of the Councils that contradict each other.

A.—Ariminum contradicts Nice. Constantinople, Frankfort, and Elleberis condemn the adoration of images, and contradict the Second of Nice. Constance, Basil, and Pisa, declare that a Council is above a Pope, and contradict Florence.

6. *Q.*—Did the early Church obey Councils as an infallible guide?

A.—No. There was no general Council at all in the Christian Church until A.D. 325.

7. *Q.*—To what dilemma does this fact reduce the Church of Rome?

A.—Either Councils are necessary or not. If necessary, the early Church had not the necessary guide. If not necessary, the Papal doctrine is false.

8. *Q.*—How have Councils proved their fallibility?

A.—By requiring belief in transubstantiation, which is contrary to the senses, and palpably false.

9. *Q.*—How is the pretended infallibility of Rome practically useless?

A.—Because Rome has never ventured to give an exposition of Scripture. She requires Scripture to be interpreted according to the sense of the Church (see second article of the Creed), and yet she has given no

sense; and because her doctrine of *intention*, which requires that the priest shall *intend* to do what the Church does, reduces the Romanist to the most painful uncertainty as to the validity of all her *seven* sacraments.

10. *Q.*—How do you disprove this dogma of infallibility?

A.—By the absence of Scripture testimony. It cannot be supposed that Christ and His Apostles established an infallible tribunal, and yet called upon men "to prove all things."

11. *Q.*—Have you any text of Scripture which *positively* declares the Church of Rome to be fallible?

A.—Yes. The Apostle, in his epistle to *that* Church, introduces this very question, and warning the Roman by the fall of the Jewish, exhorts her to be not high-minded, but fear,—to take heed lest God would not spare her; adding, if she continued not in the goodness of God, she should ALSO "BE CUT OFF," Romans xi. No language can be plainer.

CHAPTER IV.

The Rule of Faith.—The Bible the only Rule.

FIRST TWO ARTICLES OF THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV.

1st. "I most stedfastly admit and embrace apostolical and ecclesiastical *traditions*, and all other observances and constitutions of the same Church.

2d. "I also admit the Holy Scriptures, according to that sense which our holy mother the Church has held, and does hold, to which it belongs, to *judge* of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures: Neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers."—*Extracted from the* "Ordo Administrandi Sacramenti," p. 65. London, 1831.

WE have already seen, that neither tradition nor the Church is the rule. We now prove that the Bible is the only rule of faith and practice.*

* Protestants reject, but Roman Catholics receive, the books

Before we enter upon our evidence, let us consider some objections which are urged against the sufficiency of Scripture.

Objections to the Bible as the Rule.—I. It is alleged, that the Scriptures cannot be a sufficient rule, forasmuch as many, who acknowledge it as the guide to immortality, differ on various points. This, however, is no valid argument. All will admit, that the preaching of Christ was sufficient for the conversion of those to whom He addressed himself, though it had not, in every instance, the desired effect. There is a distinction between *sufficiency* and *efficiency*. The Bible is sufficient in every case; and it is efficient, likewise, *when* the Spirit of God applies its blessed truths to the heart.

II. Romanists say that we cannot prove Infant Baptism by the Bible. We maintain that we can; and the annotators of the Douay Bible, an acknowledged version among Roman Catholics, seem to think with us; for in their Table of References, they prove infant baptism by Scripture. They say, "For the baptism of infants, "St Luke xviii. 16, compared with St John iii. 5." We give the following quotation from Bellarmine:—

"Although we do not find it expressly commanded that infants should be baptised, yet that also is collected with sufficient clearness from Scripture, as we have proved."—C. 9, lib. i. *De Sacr., ut supra.*

It is foreign to our subject to enter at large upon this question.

---

called the Apocrypha, and thus the difference extends even to the canon of Scripture.

Our objections to the Apocryphal writings are these:—

1. They were never received by the Jewish Church; and "unto them were committed the oracles of God," Rom. iii. 2. Josephus, the great Jewish authority, says:—"The Jews had only twenty-two books that deserved belief, but those which were written after the time of Artaxerxes (the Apocrypha) were not of equal credit with the rest, in which period they had no prophets at all."—*Lib.* i., *con. Apion.*

2. They were never quoted by Christ and His Apostles.

3. They were rejected by the most eminent Christian Fathers.

4. They contain internal evidence of their *non*-inspiration. Suicide seems to be commended in 2 Maccab. xiv. 41, 42, and the writer apologizes for defects (xv. 39).

III. Again it is urged, that we cannot prove from the Word of God the change of the day on which the Sabbath was to be observed. This also is incorrect. The *non*-obligation of the Jewish Sabbath is evident from the following text:—

Coloss. 2. 16. Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holiday, or of the new-moon, or of *the sabbath days.*

The apostolic observance of the first day of the week, is proved from various texts:—

John 20. 19. Then the same day at evening, being *the first day of the week*, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus, and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. V 26. And *after eight days*, again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them. Then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you.

Acts 20. 7. And upon *the first day of the week*, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight.

1 Cor. 16. 2. Upon *the first day of the week* let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come.

Rev. 1. 10. I was in the Spirit on *the Lord's day.*

IV. They say, that the doctrine that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, is not provable from Scripture. The Douay annotators think otherwise, for in their note on John xv. 26 they say,—

"This proves, against the modern Greeks, that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Son as well as from the Father; otherwise He could not be sent by the Son."

V. Against Private Judgment, they quote,—

2 Peter 1. 20. Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation.

But the very next verse explains the Apostle's meaning,—

1 Peter 1. 21. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were *moved by the Holy Ghost.*

1. The Apostle merely shows, that holy Scripture is not the result of private interpretation, or merely the

opinions of men, for "holy men of God spake as they "were moved by the Holy Ghost."

2. The context also is completely destructive of the Romish doctrine. The Apostle states, that "We have "also a more sure word of prophecy;"—more sure even than the voice which came from heaven,—an argument against *oral* tradition, "whereunto ye do well that ye "take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, "until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in your "hearts," 2 Pet. i. 19. Prophecy is confessedly the most difficult portion of Scripture; and yet the Apostle, instead of dissuading the people from its study, encourages them to prosecute it,—"whereunto *ye do well* that "ye take heed, as unto *a light that shineth in a dark* "*place*." Far from dwelling upon its alleged obscurity, as Romish authors do, he compares it to a *light* shining in a dark place.

3. Why should Rome object to the exercise of private judgment in the interpretation of the Bible, seeing that she has never yet given her own infallible interpretation of it? Let her produce her infallible commentary upon Scripture, and we shall yield at once to its authority.

VI. The following passage is also quoted in support of the same objection:—

2 Peter 3. 16. As also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things: in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction.

In reference to this we observe,—

1. That the Scriptures were in the hands of the people, else they could not have "wrested them."

2. That there was no infallible sense of the Scriptures, else the Apostle would have counselled the people to follow its guidance.

3. Certain difficult passages were *wrested*, which proves that the proper use of such passages would not lead to such results.

4. The "unlearned and unstable," were not the unlearned in this world's learning,—for the Apostles them-

selves were "unlearned and ignorant men," Acts iv. 13, —but those who were untaught by the Spirit.

5. The Apostle does not prescribe, as a remedy, against such abuse of Scripture (the abuse is no argument against the use), an appeal to Pope, Council, or any infallible interpretation; but he says,—

2 Peter 3. 18. But grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

And how that growth is to be promoted, we learn from the same Apostle,—

1 Peter 2. 2. As new born babes desire the sincere milk of the *word*, that ye may *grow thereby.*

We ask the Church of Rome to produce her infallible sense of difficult places? In truth, she would interdict Scripture altogether, for she requires that Scripture shall *only* be understood according to the sense of the Church, and yet she has given no sense!

Proof that the Bible is the Rule.

I. Scripture the Mosaic Rule.—We now prove that the written law was the rule of faith to the Church of God in the Mosaic age.

1. Deut. 6. 6. And these *words*, which I command thee this day, shall be in thy heart. V 7. And thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shall talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. V 8. And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes. V 9. And thou shalt *write* them upon the posts of thy house, and on thy gates.

From this passage, it is evident, that the written law was the rule, not only of the people themselves, but of their children.

2. Deut. 11. 20. And thou shalt *write* them upon the door-posts of thine house, and upon thy gates: V 21. That your days may be multiplied, and the days of your children.

It is remarkable, that in this chapter a warning is given to the people of Israel, against the idolatry by which they were surrounded; and they are directed to the written law as the preservative from such sin.

3. Deut. 31. 12. Gather the people together, *men*, and *women*, and *children*, and thy *stranger* that is within thy gates, that they may hear, and that they may learn, and fear the Lord your God, and observe to do all *the words of this law;* V 13. And that their children, which have not known any thing, may hear, and learn to fear the Lord your God, as long as ye live in the land whither ye go over Jordan to possess it.

Here, again, is a reference to the written law as the guide of men, women, children, and even the stranger.

4. Joshua 1. 8. This *book of the law* shall not depart out of thy mouth; but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thou mayest observe to do according to all that is *written* therein: for then shalt thou make thy way prosperous, and then thou shalt have good success.

Such is the exhortation of God to Joshua, the captain of the Lord's host. He is commanded to make the book of the law his constant meditation, and the rule of his conduct, the promise being annexed,—"For then shalt "thou make thy way prosperous, and thou shalt have "good success."

5. 2 Chron. 34. 30. And the king (Josiah) went up into the house of the Lord, and all the men of Judah, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and the priests, and the Levites, and all the people, great and small; and he *read* in their ears all the words of the book of the covenant that was found in the house of the Lord.

Thus good king Josiah read, in the ears of great and small, the law of God, and then, as we are informed in the following verse, made a covenant on his own behalf, and that of the people:—

2 Chron. 34. 31. To perform the words of the covenant which are *written* in this book.

6. Similar was the conduct of Ezra,—

Neh. 8. 2. And Ezra the priest brought the law before the congregation, both of men and women, and all that could hear with understanding, upon the first day of the seventh month. V. 3. And he read therein before the street that was before the water-gate, from the morning until mid-day, before the men and the women, and those that could understand: and the ears of all the people were attentive unto the book of the law.

7. During the captivity of Israel, certain princes and Levites instructed the inhabitants of the land; and we are told,—

2 Chron. 17. 9. They taught in Judah, and had *the book* of the law of the Lord with them.

8. Thus, under the Mosaic dispensation, the principle inculcated by Isaiah the prophet was carried out,—

Isaiah 8. 20. *To the law and to the testimony:* if they speak not according to this *word*, it is because there is no light in them.

9. Isaiah also says,—

Isaiah 34. 16. Seek ye out of the *book* of the Lord, and *read*.

10. How largely do the Psalms expatiate upon the blessedness of the law! The 119th Psalm continually dwells upon this theme; and the 1st Psalm pronounces the godly man blessed,—

Psalm 1. 2. His delight is in the law of the Lord; and *in his law* doth he meditate day and night.

II. Scripture the Apostolic Rule.—The rule which existed in the Apostolic age, is the same which we have now. They had the Old Testament Scriptures, with the preaching of the Apostles, who were inspired. We have the Old Testament Scriptures, with the preaching of Christ and His Apostles, committed to writing. The New Testament may be regarded as the Apostolic comment upon the Old. It is sometimes said, that Christ gave no express commandment to write; but He did more than command, for *He actually moved* the Apostles to write.

Augustine notices this objection, and says,—

"This first is to be discussed, which some are accustomed to object—why the Lord himself wrote nothing? *Pagans chiefly start this objection.*"—*De Consen. Evang.*, lib. i. chap. vii.

He says again,—

"When they (the Apostles) wrote what He shewed and said, *it is by no means to be inferred that He himself did not write*, since He, as the Head, *dictated* what his members put down; for whatsoever He wished that we should know of His deeds or sayings, He *commanded to be written as by His own hands.*"—*Aug. de Con. Evang.* lib. i. p. 26, tom. iii. Paris, 1680.

1. The written Word of God is referred to by Jesus and His Apostles, as the great authority.—(1.) In the temptation, Jesus thrice repelled Satan by saying, "It "is written," Matt. iv. (2.) When refuting the errors

of the Sadducees, He said, "Ye do err, *not knowing the* "*Scriptures*, and the power of God," Matt. xxii. 29. (3.) He represents Abraham as saying to the rich man, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will "they be persuaded though one rose from the dead," Luke xvi. 31. (4.) His commandment is express, "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have "eternal life: and they are they which testify of me," John v. 39. (5.) The Apostle John says, "These "are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the "Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might "have life through his name," John xx. 31. (6). After the resurrection, when conversing with the disciples as they journeyed to Emmaus, the Saviour says, "O fools "and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have "spoken! Ought not Christ to have suffered these "things, and to enter into his glory? *And beginning at* "*Moses and all the prophets*, he expounded *unto them in all* "*the Scriptures* the things concerning himself," Luke xxiv. 25-27. In no one instance does our Lord refer to tradition, but invariably His appeal is made to the written law.

2. The disciples follow the example of their Master,—

(1.) Acts 17. 2. And Paul, as his *manner* was, went in unto them, and three Sabbath-days reasoned with them out of the scriptures.

(2.) Apollos, "an eloquent man, and mighty in the "Scriptures, came to Ephesus," and "mightily con- "vinced the Jews, and that publicly, shewing by *the* "*scriptures* that Jesus was Christ," Acts xviii. 24 and 28.

(3.) Paul, when standing before Agrippa, said,—

Acts 26. 22. Having therefore obtained help of God, I continue unto this day, witnessing both to small and great, *saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come.*

(4.) The same Apostle says,—

Rom. 15. 4. For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning; that we, through patience and comfort of the scriptures, might have hope.

(5.) Again, Paul writes to Timothy,—

2 Tim. 3. 15. And that *from a child* thou hast known the holy scriptures, which *are able to make thee wise* unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. V. 16. All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; V. 17. That the man of God may be *perfect*, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.

This text proves,—1. That children should be instructed in Scripture; 2. That Scripture is able to make wise unto salvation; 3. That all Scripture is given by inspiration; 4. That it is so complete and full as to be able to make the man of God perfect.

(6.) St John says,—

Rev. 1. 3. *Blessed is he that readeth*, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein: for the time is at hand.

The Revelation is the most difficult book, and yet a blessing is promised to him who readeth it.

III. The Bible, alone Inspired, alone the Rule.—The written word is necessarily our only rule, *for it alone is inspired.* We reject not the testimony of history to facts, nor the aid of learning in the interpretation of the Divine Word; but we believe that the Bible is the sole rule; and we feel assured, that the man who humbly prays for the teaching of the Spirit, will be guided unto saving truth. It is written, "If any of you lack "wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men "liberally, and upbraideth not; and *it shall be given* "*him*," James i. 5.

Questions and Answers.

1. *Q.*—Some object that Scripture cannot be a sufficient rule, because there are differences between those who receive it as their rule. How do you answer this?

A.—By showing the distinction between *sufficiency* and *efficiency*. The preaching of Christ was sufficient to convert all, though it did not effect this; so the Scriptures.

2. *Q.*—How do you answer the Romish objection, that the Scriptures are not sufficient to prove infant baptism?

A.—By referring to the Scripture proof, and also to

the notes in the Douay Bible, *the authorised Romish Version*, which admit the fact.

3. *Q.*—It is objected that the doctrine, that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son as well as the Father, is not provable by Scripture. Answer this.

A.—I prove it by John xv. 26; and the notes of the Douay Bible admit that it can be proved.

4. *Q.*—What is the meaning of the text where it is said, that no Scripture is of private interpretation? 2 Pet. i. 20.

A.—The Apostle speaks of the *origin* of Scripture, and shows that it is not a mere human composition, or a private interpretation; for he adds, that "holy men of God "spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

5. *Q.*—Is this passage, taken with the context, favourable to Romanism?

A.—No. For the Apostle commends the study of prophecy, and far from forbidding it as obscure, compares it to a light in a dark place.

6. *Q.*—Has Rome given an authorised exposition of Scripture?

A.—No; not of one chapter of the Bible, and yet she requires that we shall not judge of it for ourselves; and thus her rule amounts to a complete prohibition of Scripture.

7. *Q.*—Does that passage where Peter says, 2 Peter iii. 16, that persons *wrested* certain portions of Scripture, prove that we are not to use it?

A.—No; for the *abuse* or *wresting* of a thing, is no argument against the use. Meat and fire may be so abused as to produce gluttony and conflagration; are we, therefore, to give up meat and fire? The passage proves, on the contrary, that the Scriptures were in the hands of the people, and that there was no infallible sense of them, else the Apostle would have called our attention to such a sense as a preservative against error.

8. *Q.*—How do you prove that Scripture was the rule under the Mosaic dispensation?

A.—By various texts,—Deut. vi. 6-9; xi. 18-22; xxxi.

11-13; Josh. i. 8; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 29-33; Neh. viii.; 2 Chron. xvii. 8, 9; Isa. viii. 20; xxxiv. 16.

9. *Q.*—How do you answer the objection, that Christ gave no commandment to write?

A.—By showing that He did more than command, for He actually inspired His disciples to write.

10. *Q.*—How do you prove that Christ and His Apostles referred to Scripture as the great standard, and that the Bible is our rule?

A.—By many texts,—Matt. iv. 4, 7, 10; xxii. 29; Luke xvi. 31; xxiv. 25-27; John v. 39; xx. 31; Acts xvii. 3, 11; xviii. 28; xxvi. 22; Romans xv. 4; 2 Tim. iii. 15-17; Rev. i. 3.

CHAPTER V.

The Seven Sacraments.—Are there Seven?

THIRD ARTICLE OF THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV.

"I also profess, that there are truly and properly seven sacraments of the new law, instituted by Jesus Christ, our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not all for every one: To wit, Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony, and that they confer grace; and that of these, Baptism, Confirmation, and Orders, cannot be reiterated without sacrilege. And I also receive and admit the received and approved ceremonies of the Catholic Church, used in the solemn administration of all the aforesaid sacraments."—*Extracted from the* "Ordo Administrandi Sacramenti," p. 65. London, 1831.

THE Church of Rome holds, that there are seven sacraments, while Protestants believe that there are but two. She admits that *Divine* appointment is necessary for the institution of a sacrament, with an outward element ordained by Christ. The Creed states,—

"I do also profess, that there be truly and properly seven sacraments of the new law *instituted by Christ*."

The True Sacraments.

I. **Baptism** was instituted by Christ, Matt. xxviii. 19, with the outward element of water. It is therefore admitted to be a sacrament.

II. The Lord's Supper, or the Eucharist, was instituted by Christ, with the outward elements of bread and wine. It is therefore admitted to be a sacrament. The five new sacraments of the Church of Rome cannot, however, bear the same test. Let us take them in order, and we shall find that they are defective in one respect or other.

The False Sacraments.

I. Confirmation was not instituted by Christ. Though Protestant Episcopalians practise Confirmation, yet they regard it as a Church ordinance, not as an institution by Christ. Hands were laid on by the Apostles, but it was for the communication of the *extraordinary* gifts of the Spirit.

The Church of Rome acknowledges her uncertainty as to the time of the institution of this supposed sacrament. Dr Doyle's Catechism contains the following:—

"*Q.* Where did Christ ordain this sacrament?

"*A. The time is not certain;* but divines most probably hold it was instituted at Christ's last supper, or between the resurrection and ascension."—*Abridgment of Christian Doctrine*, p. 77. Dublin, 1841.

II. Penance, as we shall show in a future chapter, was not appointed by Christ.

III. Extreme Unction* was not instituted by Christ. Mark vi. and James v. are quoted in its favour.

1. Mark 6. 13. And they cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them.

Cardinal Bellarmine, however, admits that this passage does not refer to Extreme Unction, and he gives the following reasons for his assertion:—1. The anointing spoken of in Mark relates chiefly to the cure of the *body*, whereas Extreme Unction relates to the *soul*. 2. The Apostles were not priests at that time, and therefore could not confer Extreme Unction; because he insists, that priests only could administer that rite. 3. The

* It is the anointing with oil of those who are supposed to be on the point of death.

Apostles anointed those who were not in danger of death, as probably the blind; but Extreme Unction is only given to those on the point of death. 4. He says that the Apostles probably anointed *infidels*, whereas Extreme Unction is intended only for the *baptised*. Here is the candid admission of a Roman Catholic Cardinal, and his reasoning is incontrovertible!—*Bell. De Ext. Unct.*, c. 2, lit. i., p. 705, tom. 3. Prag. 1721.

2. James 5. 14. Is any sick among you? let him call for the elders of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: V 15. And the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall *raise* him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him.

Bossuet quotes this passage in proof of Extreme Unction; but as great an authority in the Church of Rome as he, *denies* that it refers to that rite. Cardinal Cajetan, the learned opponent of Luther, was candid enough to write as follows:—

"It *cannot* be gathered from these words, nor from the effect here mentioned, that the Apostle speaketh of Sacramental or *Extreme* Unction, but rather of that anointing which Christ appointed in the Gospel to be used in *healing* the sick. For the text saith *not*, Is any man sick *to death?* but, Is *any man sick?* and the effect he attributeth to the anointing, is the ease *or raising of the sick.* Of the remission of sins he speaks but conditionally; whereas Extreme Unction is given to none *but at the point of death*, and directly tendeth to remission of sins. And hereunto, that St James commandeth *many* Elders to be sent for, both to pray for and anoint the sick, which is *not done in Extreme* Unction."—*Com. Epist. James, in loco.* Paris, 1532.

Such is the admission of the learned Cajetan. The *reasons*, however, which he gives, incontrovertibly show, that the passage does not prove the Romish rite of Extreme Unction. Cajetan thought that the practice should be received on the authority of the Church.

Thus two of Rome's ablest men, Bellarmine and Cajetan, concede respectively that these passages do not refer to Extreme Unction.

The Church of Rome again admits her uncertainty as to the time of institution. Dr Doyle's Catechism contains the following question and answer:—

"*Q.*—When did Christ institute it?

"*A.*—*The time* is uncertain. *Some think* it was instituted at his

last supper; *others* that it was done betwixt his resurrection and ascension."—*P.* 101, *ut supra.*

IV. Orders, or the ordination of ministers, was instituted by Christ; but he appointed no outward element.

V. Matrimony was instituted by God in Paradise, four thousand years before Christ, and therefore it is not an *institution* of the new law.

The Church of Rome again admits her uncertainty on this point. Dr Doyle's Catechism contains the following:—

"*Q.*—When was it made a sacrament of the new law?

"*A* — *When and where* Christ instituted this sacrament is uncertain."—*P.* 105, *ut supra.*

Romanists endeavour to prove that Matrimony is a sacrament, by a mistranslation of Scripture,—"This is "a great mystery," Ephes. v. 32, they render, "This is "a great sacrament;" but Cardinal Cajetan, in reference to this subject also, makes the following candid admission:—

"You have not from this place, O prudent reader,—from Paul,—that marriage was a sacrament; FOR HE DOES NOT SAY THAT IT WAS A GREAT SACRAMENT, BUT A GREAT MYSTERY."—*Apud Chamier, De Sacram.*, c. 3, lib. iv.

Thus, when we examine these *five new* sacraments of Rome, we find that they are without some essential characteristic of a sacrament.

Clerical Celibacy not provable from Scripture.—It is most strange that while Rome raises Matrimony to the rank of a sacrament, she at the same time refuses it to her clergy. On the one hand, she unduly exalts this ordinance, and on the other, she degrades it. In support of clerical celibacy, Romanists refer to—

1 Cor. 7. 8. I say therefore to the unmarried and widows, It is good for them if they abide even as I.

1. We answer, that the Apostle addresses laity, and not only the clergy. He speaks both of men and women. Indeed, when this epistle was written, there is good reason to believe that there were no clergy at Corinth. The ministrations were conducted by prophets. Will the Church of Rome argue from this passage for general *lay* celibacy?

2. The recommendation was given on account of the persecutions then existing. 1 Cor. vii. 26, "I suppose, therefore, that this is good for the present distress: I say that it is good for a man so to be."

3. The Apostle says, 1 Cor. vii. 9, "If they cannot contain, let them marry." The Church of Rome disregards this. She ordains that the clergy shall not marry under any circumstances. We see, then, that the passage gives no support whatever, but the contrary, to Romish celibacy.

Clerical Marriage lawful according to Scripture.—That it is lawful for the clergy to marry, is evident from the express statements of God's Word:—

1 Cor. 9. 5. Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as other apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas (Peter).

1 Tim. 3. 2. A bishop must then be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach. V 4. One that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity; V 8. Likewise must the deacons be grave, not double-tongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre; V 11. Even so must their wives be grave, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things.

The Jewish Priests married.

Admissions of Romanists as to the Sacraments.

But to return to the subject of the septenary number, some of the Schoolmen, or eminent writers of the Church of Rome before the Reformation, have made remarkable statements in reference to various sacraments so called.

Alexander of Hales, a great authority, says,—

"*The Sacrament of Confirmation*, as it is a sacrament, was *not* ordained by *Christ* or his *Apostles;* BUT AFTERWARDS WAS ORDAINED IN THE COUNCIL OF MELDA."—*Fol.* 198. Colon. 1622.

Dominicus Soto says,—

"That Episcopal Ordination is not *truly* and *properly* (*vere et proprie*) a Sacrament."—*Bell. Tom.* III., p. 718. Prag. 1721.

Canus, Bishop of the Canary Isles, in 1550, says,—

"Divines speak *so uncertainly* of the matter and form of matrimony, that he should be accounted *a fool*, who, in so great a difference of opinion, would take upon him to establish *a certain and known doctrine*."—*Locis Theologis*, p. 392. Colon. 1605.

Durandus, a great authority in the Church of Rome, says,—

"Matrimony is not a sacrament *strictly and properly called*, as are other sacraments of the new law."—Fo. cccc. xviii. Paris, 1508.

Suaresius, the Jesuit, a vehement writer *against* the Reformation, says that HUGO, PETER LOMBARD, BONAVENTURE, HALLENSIS, and ALTISIODORUS, the chief schoolmen before his time, *denied that the Sacrament of Extreme Unction was instituted by Christ*,—

"Some denied that this sacrament was instituted by Christ, FROM WHICH IT PLAINLY FOLLOWS THAT IT WAS NOT A TRUE SACRAMENT."—P. 512, *Tom.* 4. Mogunt, 1616.

Cassander says, that—

"You shall find NONE BEFORE LOMBARD'S TIME, who did *determine* the *certain* number of Sacraments."—P. 107, *Consultat.* Lugd. 1608.

Peter Lombard was the first who defined the septenary number. It was not until the Council of Florence, A.D. 1439, that the seven sacraments were formally decreed.

The Fathers and the Sacraments.—The ancient Fathers call many things by the term *Sacrament*. They speak of the sacrament of thirst; the sacrament of weeping; the sacrament of the Christian religion; the sacrament of prayer; the sacrament of the scriptures; and Jerome says,—

"That the Book of Revelation has as many sacraments as words."—P. 278, *Tom.* i. Veron. 1734.

They use the word sacrament in a *large* and *undefined* sense. But, at the same time, it is evident from their works, that they recognised only two sacraments, properly speaking.

For example, Augustine says,—

"Our Lord and His Apostles have delivered unto us a few signs (sacraments) instead of many, and the same for performance, easy; for signification, most excellent; for observation, most reverend;—as is the sacrament of baptism, and the celebration of the body and blood of our God."—Part I., col. 49. Par. 1679–1700.

Again,—

"Christ's side was struck, as the Gospel speaketh, and presently there issued out of it water and blood, which are the *twin* sacra-

ments of the Church,—water, whereby the spouse is purified; and blood, wherewith she is endowed."—Lib. ii. *De Symb. ad Catech.*, c. 6, *Tom.* 6, *ut supra.*

Chrysostom, commenting upon the words, *Exivit sanguis et aqua*,—"And forthwith came thereout blood and water," John xix. 34, says,—

"That they flowed not by accident; but because of these *two*, the Church is framed, or consisteth."—P. 914; *Homily*, 84. Eton, 1613.

The Fathers, or ancient writers, were no doubt unsound in some of their views, for error was early in its rise; but it is a well-established fact, that they were not Roman Catholics. It is evident, therefore, that while they employed the word in a large sense, they acknowledged but *two* sacraments, strictly speaking.

The Church of Rome, by the use which the Fathers make of the word, is placed on the horns of a dilemma; for either they used it in a general, or in a defined sense. If in a general sense, the advocates of that Church cannot plead that use in favour of the *septenary* number. If in a defined strict sense, Rome has fallen far short of the true number; and instead of seven, ought to have many more. The number of seven was not settled for at least a thousand years after Christ. Sir Humphrey Lynde* gives the following challenge:—

"If any learned man alive shall prove that the seven Sacraments were instituted by Christ, and that all the Fathers, or *any* of the Fathers in the Primitive Church, or *any known author for above a thousand years after Christ*, did teach that there were *neither more nor less* than seven Sacraments, truly and properly so called, and to be believed of all for an article of faith (all which is the constant doctrine of the Church of Rome), let anathema fall upon my head."—*Via tuta.*

The Doctrine of Intention.—The doctrine of Intention, in reference to the sacrament, is of great importance. The Council of Trent decrees:—

"If any one shall say, that in ministers, while they form and give the sacraments, *intention* is not required, at least of doing what the Church does, let him be anathema."—*Canons of Trent*, p. 52. Paris, 1832.

Thus, if the priest or bishop want intention in ad-

* An able controversialist in the 17th century.

ministering the sacraments, they are invalid,—Baptism, Eucharist, Confirmation, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, Marriage. What a fearful consequence of want of intention, and in what dire uncertainty must the dogma place the Romanist!

Let us suppose the following case:—A child is baptised, but for want of intention on the part of the priest, his baptism is invalid. He grows up to man's estate, and is ordained a priest, but his ordination is invalid in consequence of the original flaw in his baptism. He has no power, therefore, to consecrate the Host, and in leading his people to worship a mere unconsecrated cake, he is the minister of idolatry to his flock. He becomes a bishop, and ordains, but all his acts are invalid, and at last, perhaps, he, or some one of those he has baptised or ordained, ascends the pontifical throne, but being without Baptism, Orders, or Consecration, the Church is left without a head—a corse!

Notwithstanding Rome's loud boast of infallibility and certainty, no Roman Catholic can be assured that he possesses a single sacrament!

Bellarmine says,—

"No one can be certain with the certainty of faith, that he has a true sacrament, since the sacrament is not formed without the intention of the minister, and NO ONE CAN SEE the INTENTION of ANOTHER."—*Tom.* i. p. 488. Prag. 1721.

Questions and Answers.

1. *Q.*—Why do you not acknowledge five of the seven sacraments recognised by Rome?

A.—Because Confirmation, Penance, Extreme Unction, and Matrimony, were not instituted by Christ, (Matrimony was instituted 4000 years before,) and Orders, though instituted by Christ, was not accompanied with an outward element.

2. *Q.*—Have eminent Roman Catholic writers made admissions upon this subject?

A.—Yes.—1. Bellarmine admits that Mark vi. 13 does not refer to Extreme Unction. Cardinal Cajetan that James v. 13, 14, does not refer to the same rite.

2. Alexander of Hales admits that Confirmation was not instituted by Christ. 3. Dominicus Soto, that Episcopal ordination is not a sacrament. 4. Canus, Bishop of the Canary Isles, that the sacramental character of Matrimony is very uncertain. 5. Durandus, that Matrimony cannot be strictly called a sacrament. 6. Hugo, Peter Lombard, Bonaventure, Hallensis, and Altisiodorus, the great schoolmen of the day, according to Suaresius, denied that Extreme Unction was instituted by Christ.

3. *Q.*—How do you understand the apostolic recommendation of non-marriage in 1 Cor. vii. 26?

A.—It is addressed to laity, and was given on account of the existing distress.

4. *Q.*—Prove from Scripture that it is lawful for clergymen to marry.

A.—The apostle says that bishops and deacons should be the husband of one wife.

5. *Q.*—What is the doctrine of Rome as to Intention?

A.—That the intention of the priest is necessary for the validity of the sacraments.

6. *Q.*—What is the consequence of this doctrine?

A.—No Roman Catholic priest can be certain that he was validly ordained, and no layman that he is validly baptised, confirmed, absolved, or anointed. No Roman Catholic can be certain that the Host which he adores as God is validly consecrated.

7. *Q.*—What is the admission of Bellarmine?

A.—That no Roman Catholic can be certain that he has a true sacrament, because he cannot see the *intention* of the priest!

CHAPTER VI.

The Seven Sacraments.—Penance.

THIRD ARTICLE OF THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV.

"I also profess, that there are truly and properly seven sacraments of the new law, instituted by Jesus Christ, our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not all for every one: To wit, Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme

Unction, Orders, and Matrimony, and that they confer grace; and that of these, Baptism, Confirmation, and Orders, cannot be reiterated without sacrilege. And I also receive and admit the received and approved ceremonies of the Catholic Church, used in the solemn administration of all the aforesaid sacraments."—*Extracted from the* "Ordo Administrandi Sacramenti," p. 65. London, 1831.

THE Church of Rome teaches, that Christ has established a *Tribunal* upon earth for the pardon of sin, in which priests are the judges. In order to prevent misconception, we shall allow her own advocates to explain her views.

Bossuet, the Bishop of Meaux, says,—

"We believe that Jesus Christ has been pleased that those who have submitted themselves to the government of the Church by baptism, and who have since violated the laws of the Gospel, should come and submit themselves to the judgment of the same Church, in the tribunal of penance, where she exercises the power which is given her, of remitting and retaining sins (Matt. xviii. 18; John xx. 23). . . . . This penitential court of justice being so necessary a curb to licentiousness—so plentiful a source of wise admonitions—so sensible a consolation for souls afflicted for their sins, when their absolution is not only declared in general terms, but when they are in reality absolved by the authority of Jesus Christ, after a particular examination and knowledge of the case."—*Exposition*, p. 33. Dublin, 1831.

Thus Penance is a regular tribunal, or "court of jus-"tice," where causes are heard in a spiritual sense, and sentence pronounced; or, in other words, where absolution is either refused or granted.

Romish Absolution Judicial.—The Council of Trent declares, that absolution by the priest is a judicial act, and hurls a curse against any one who shall deny this proud dogma.

"If any one shall say, that the sacramental absolution of the priest is not a judicial act, but a bare ministerial act of pronouncing and declaring to the person confessing, that his sins are forgiven, provided only he believes himself to be absolved; or if the priest does not seriously absolve him, but only in joke, or shall say, that the confession of the penitent is not required for absolution, let him be accursed."—*Council of Trent*, p. 102. Paris, 1832.

Rome requires Contrition or Attrition.—Rome, however, requires contrition, or at least attrition, on the part of the penitent. Attrition, according to the Council of Trent, being an imperfect sort of contrition,

which "arises from a consideration of the turpitude of "sin, or from a fear of hell and punishment."—*Council of Trent*, p. 90. Paris, 1832.

The Abridgment of Christian Doctrine, a standard work among Romanists, fully explains this subject:—

"*Q.*—How many parts hath the sacrament of Penance?

"*A.*—It hath three parts,—namely, contrition, confession, and satisfaction.

"*Q.*—What is contrition?

"*A.*—It is a hearty sorrow for our sins, proceeding immediately from the love of God above all things, and joined with a firm purpose of amendment.

"*Q.*—What is attrition?

"*A.*—It is imperfect contrition, arising from the consideration of the turpitude of sin, or fear of punishment; and if it contain a detestation of sin, and hope of pardon, it is so far from being itself wicked, that though alone it justify not, yet it prepares the way to justification; and disposes us, at least remotely, towards obtaining God's grace in this sacrament.

"*Q.*—What if a dying man be in mortal sin, and cannot have a priest?

"*A.*—Then nothing but perfect contrition will suffice, it being impossible to be saved without the love of God."—P. 98. Dublin, 1841.

Thus, it seems, that attrition, with the absolution of the priest, will avail; but if the priest be not at hand to pronounce absolution over the dying sinner, the attrition of the latter is vain, and he must perish!

Romish Doctrine as to the Necessity of Absolution.—The Church of Rome teaches, that the absolution of the priest conveys forgiveness to the soul; and that without such absolution, except in some *extraordinary* case, forgiveness cannot be obtained.

The Roman Catholic Institute of England, in No. 39 of their stereotyped tracts, says,—

"Now, though only God can make the incredulous feel the force of truth, yet I, or any one who has attentively read the Divine Oracles, can make it as plain as the noon-day light (to those who wish to see the light), that Christ did transfer this power of forgiving to His Apostles and their successors; and that, ordinarily speaking, through this transferred power only, can forgiveness be obtained from that to the end of time."—*Tracts of the Institute.* London.

From these documents it is evident, that Rome teaches,—1. That Penance is a divine tribunal, or court of jus-

tice. 2. That the priests are the judges. 3. That the absolution of the priest is a judicial act, conveying forgiveness to the soul of him who has contrition or attrition. 4. That through this transferred power *only* (ordinarily speaking), forgiveness is conveyed.

In the first place, we shall consider the subject of Judicial Absolution; and, in the second place, that of Sacramental Confession.

Romish Arguments on Absolution.

I. Bossuet quotes two texts in support of this dogma, and these are the texts usually quoted,—

John 20. 21. Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you: as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. V 22. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. V 23. Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.

1. We observe, that though there is a similarity between the mission of Christ from the Father, and of the Apostles from Christ, yet it would be blasphemous, and contrary to fact, to say, that they were possessed of *equal* powers. In some respects there was a similarity between the mission of our Lord and His Apostles; but their office and work were quite distinct. Christ was sent to *save* by His death; the Apostles were sent not to save, but to make known that salvation to others.

2. Even if the Saviour, in this text, committed the power of forgiving sin to His Apostles, it would not therefore follow that the Roman priests possess the same power. Surely there is a wide difference between the Apostles of our Lord and the priests of Rome! The Apostles, individually, were infallible in their teaching: the priests of Rome do not pretend to be infallible as individuals. The Apostles wrought miracles: let the priests prove that they are equal to the Apostles by doing the same.

3. We deny that the Romish priests are the successors of the Apostles. Ambrose, one of the fathers, well observes, They have not "the inheritance of Peter, who

"have not the faith of Peter," Ambrose, *De Pœnit.* c. 6, tom. i. p. 156. Basil.* The Greek Church—more ancient than Rome—and the church of "the holy land" itself, can establish a far better claim to apostolic descent; and yet, forsooth, that church, as well as all Protestant communities, according to all Romish doctrine, are out of the pale of salvation!

4. It is evident, that the power of judicially forgiving sins was not committed even to the Apostles; for we nowhere read in the Inspired Record of their acts of the exercise of that power. We shall recur to this.

5. The Church of Rome herself does not receive the passage in its literal meaning. If understood according to the letter, and if applicable to the Roman priests, it would confer on them the power of forgiving or condemning whom they pleased unconditionally; and then the priest might say to one, "I pardon you;" and to another, "I condemn you." But we have seen, that, according to Romish doctrine, contrition, or at least attrition, is required. Thus the Church of Rome herself allows a latitude of interpretation, and does not adhere to the letter. This is an important concession, and with it let us now see what was the meaning of the Saviour's words.

He was about to send out His Apostles to preach the Gospel to every creature. He had forewarned them of the trials which they should encounter; and He tells them, that as the Father had sent Him, so He sends them. The Saviour's mission was one of pain and woe; so would theirs be. His had for its object the salvation of mankind; so would theirs be "the ministry of reconciliation." And He breathed on them, communicating the Holy Ghost, afterwards vouchsafed more abundantly, and rendering them infallible teachers of truth! For their encouragement, He says, "Whose soever sins ye "remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever "sins ye retain, they are retained;"—as though He had

* In some editions the word *sedem* is given for *fidem*—a manifest corruption.

said, Whose soever sins ye are the means of remitting, by your preaching of the Gospel, they will be remitted; and whose soever sins ye retain, they will be retained: for the Gospel, while it is "the savour of life unto life" to some, is "the savour of death unto death" to others. The Gospel is a witness against "all nations," and will add to the guilt and condemnation of those who reject it. Even the Romish priesthood do not claim the power of literally retaining sins, or condemning the sinner.

The question is, *How* did the Apostles remit sins? Rome says, by an "*Absolvo te.*" We say, by the preaching of the Gospel; and we shall appeal to the *practice* of the Apostles as evidence.

All ministers remit sins by *the preaching of Christ.*

Rome says, that a certain form of absolution is necessary. Liguori, in accordance with his church, teaches, that the indicative form "*absolvo te,*" is essential, though several divines, according to the same Liguori, admit, that that very form did not exist until a thousand years after Christ!

II. Bossuet also refers to,—

Matt. 18. 18. Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.

Our observations upon John xx. 21-23 (page 77), are partly applicable to this. The Apostles, as in part the founders of Christianity, possessed the power of binding and loosing—of releasing the people from the burdensome rites of the law, and of binding upon them what was necessary, in faith or practice.

An instance of this loosing and binding is recorded in,—

Acts 15. 28. For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things; V 29. That ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication: from which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well.

Thus, with reference to the points then under discussion, they loosed believers from circumcision, and rendered it binding upon them to abstain from certain things.

The Apostles, inspired from above, necessarily exercised authority in founding the Christian Church; but, pray, does this prove that the absolution of the Romish priest is the divine channel of forgiveness?

Romish Absolution Refuted.

1. The notion of any such tribunal, much less of a Roman one, is wholly without authority. Proud is the assumption—lofty is the pretension; but the superstructure rests upon a sandy foundation. If such a tribunal were really established, it would be the most prominent feature of Christianity, as it is that of Romanism; but we find no trace of it in the Word of God. All judges can produce undoubted credentials. Let the priests do so, and we shall obey them.

2. The Apostles nowhere remitted sins by a form of absolution. How did they fulfil the commission which they received? Let their "Acts" answer. Peter said to the multitudes on the day of Pentecost, "Repent" (mistranslated *Do penance* in the Douay version), "and "be baptised every one of you in the name of Jesus "Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive "the gift of the Holy Ghost," Acts ii. 38.

Again he said,—

Acts 4. 12. Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved.

Paul said,—

Acts 13. 38. Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that *through this man* is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: V 39. And by him all *that believe* are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses.

Again he said,—

Acts 16. 31. Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.

Everywhere the Apostles went preaching Christ as "the way, the truth, and the life;" for "Him," said they, "hath God exalted with his right hand to be a "Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, "and forgiveness of sins," Acts v. 31.

3. The Apostles nowhere speak of such a tribunal in their writings. Had the power of forgiving sin been committed to them, it would have been the most important part of their office, and one of the leading doctrines of Christianity. Can we imagine that they were so remiss, as never to have discharged this important function, and nowhere to have alluded to the tribunal in their Epistles? John says, "If any man sin we have "an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous," 1 John ii. 1. He does not say we have a tribunal to which we can repair, and in which, having confessed our sins, we may receive absolution. No; he directs us to the mediation of Christ.

The incestuous Corinthian was restored to Church communion; but his was but the remission of *ecclesiastical* censure, 2 Cor. ii. 6–10.

The Apostles would have been negligent, indeed, if they had known of a tribunal through which alone pardon could be obtained, and yet never made reference to it.

4. Remission of sin and salvation, throughout the Bible, are connected with *faith in Christ*, nowhere with an "*Absolvo te.*"

John 3. 36. He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.

Rom. 5. 1. Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.

Everywhere, the one great exhortation of the New Testament is, "Believe and be saved;" but, No, says the Church of Rome, there is a tribunal upon earth, and only through the absolution of the priest, who sits therein as judge, ordinarily speaking, can forgiveness be obtained.

Questions and Answers.

1. *Q.*—What is the doctrine of Rome as to Penance?

A.—That God has established a tribunal upon earth, in which the priest is judge, and in which it is necessary

that the penitent should confess his sins, in order to receive absolution,—the Divine channel of forgiveness.

2. *Q.*—What texts are quoted in its favour?

A.—John xx. 23; Matt. xviii. 18.

3. *Q.*—How do you understand the first text?

A.—It means that sin is to be remitted by the preaching of the Gospel.

4. *Q.*—How is this view sustained?

A.—By the fact, that the Apostles always preached forgiveness through Christ, and nowhere pronounced a form of absolution.

5. *Q.*—To what does the binding and loosing refer? Matt. xviii.

A.—To the authority which was committed to the Apostles to abrogate the ceremonial law, and to bind upon believers what was necessary in faith and practice.

6. *Q.*—Is there any instance of such binding and loosing?

A.—Yes; in Acts xv. 24–29.

7. *Q.*—How do you disprove the Papal idea of an absolving tribunal?

A.—1. It is without authority. 2. The Apostles nowhere remitted sin by a form of absolution, but by preaching Christ. 3. They never inform us of so important a tribunal, which, no doubt, they would have done, had it been in existence. 4. The Bible everywhere connects remission of sin with faith in Christ, without any reference to absolution.

CHAPTER VII.

The Seven Sacraments—Penance, Auricular Confession.

THIRD ARTICLE OF THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV.

"I also profess, that there are truly and properly seven sacraments of the new law, instituted by Jesus Christ, our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not all for every one: To wit, Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony, and that they confer grace; and

that of these, Baptism, Confirmation, and Orders, cannot be reiterated without sacrilege. And I also receive and admit the received and approved ceremonies of the Catholic Church, used in the solemn administration of all the aforesaid sacraments."—*Extracted from the* "Ordo Administrandi Sacramenti," p. 65. London, 1831.

THE practice of Auricular Confession is based upon the supposed power of the priesthood to forgive sins. It is needful, they say, for the priest, as judge, to know all circumstances, that he may adjudicate accordingly.

The Priest an assumed Judge.—The following passage, from the *Grounds of Catholic Doctrine*, a catechism much used among Romanists, expresses this sentiment:—

"*Q.*—How do you prove, from the texts above quoted, of John xx. 22, 23, and Matt. xviii. 18, the necessity of the faithful confessing their sins to the pastors of the Church, in order to obtain the absolution and remission of them?

"*A.*—Because, in the text above quoted, Christ has made the pastors of His Church His judges in the court of conscience, with commission and authority to bind or to loose, to forgive or to retain sins, according to the merits of the cause and the disposition of the penitents. Now, as no judge can pass sentence without having a full knowledge of the cause, which cannot be had in this kind of causes which regards men's consciences, but by their own confession, it clearly follows, that He who has made the pastors of His Church the judges of men's consciences, has also laid an obligation upon the faithful to lay open the state of their consciences to them, if they hope to have their sins remitted. Nor would our Lord have given to His Church the power of retaining sins, much less the keys of the kingdom of heaven (Matt. xvi. 19), if such sins as exclude men from the kingdom of heaven might be remitted independently of the keys of the Church."—P. 22. Dublin.

Thus the Church of Rome, taking it for granted that the priest is a judge in the penitential tribunal, invested with power to forgive sin, requires, as a consequence, that her members shall practise secret confession to him. We have already seen, that the texts referred to do not constitute the pastors of the Church judges "in the court of conscience." We disprove the premises; the conclusion therefore fails. We have seen that the foundation is unsound: it follows that the superstructure is not secure.

Scripture does not warrant Auricular Confession.

—Auricular Confession finds no support in Scripture. Some passages are quoted by members of the Church of Rome, but with trembling and evident hesitancy. The same *Grounds of Catholic Doctrine* says,—

"*Q.*—Have you any other texts of Scripture which favour the Catholic doctrine and practice of Confession?

"*A.*—Yes; we find in the old law, which was a figure of the law of Christ, that such as were infected with the leprosy, which was a figure of sin, were obliged to show themselves to the priests, and subject themselves to their judgment, (see Lev. xiii. xiv., and Matt. iii. 4), which, according to the holy fathers, was an emblem of the confession of sins in the sacrament of Penance. And in the same law, a special confession of sins was expressly prescribed, (Numb. v. 6, 7),—'When a man or woman shall have committed any of all the sins that men are wont to commit, and by negligence shall have transgressed the commandment of the Lord, and offended, they shall confess their sin.' The same is prescribed in the New Testament (James v. 16),—'Confess therefore your sins, one to another;' that is, to the priests or elders of the Church, whom the Apostles ordered to be called for (v. 14); and this was evidently the practice of the first Christians (Acts xix. 18), 'Many that believed came, and confessing, and declaring their deeds."—P. 22. Dublin.

These texts of Scripture must at once appear to be utterly insufficient to establish the point.

1. Leprosy was indeed a type of sin, and the priesthood were typical, not of a priesthood under the Christian dispensation, but of "the Apostle and high priest of our profession"—the Lord Jesus Christ.

Public Confession was practised in the early Church, as testified by the Fathers; but secret auricular confession was not the rule of the Church. To Christ let us go to show our sins; for "he is able to save them to the utter-"most that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth "to make intercession for them," Heb. vii. 25.

2. The duty of acknowledging or confessing sin, is maintained by all parties, and it was commanded in Numbers v. 6, 7. But *private* sacramental confession to a priest, with a view to judicial absolution, is altogether another thing.

3. "Confess your faults one to another," James v. 16, is rather a proof *against* auricular confession to a priest. The Apostle, though he had said that in certain cases the elders of the church should be called in, yet, instead

of commanding that the patient should confess to *them*, gives the exhortation, "Confess your faults *one to another*,"—which implies, that it is as much the duty of the priest to confess to the layman, as the layman to the priest.

4. Those who "came, and confessing, and *declaring* "their deeds," Acts xix. 18, did so openly, which is altogether different from *auricular* confession, which signifies confession *whispered* in the ear, or secret. In the next verse, we are told of those who "brought their "books together, and burned them before all men."

Groundless, indeed, is the system of *auricular* confession, and all the texts that can be adduced in its favour, relate to the *public* acknowledgment of sin.

Auricular Confession Refuted.—We are opposed to auricular confession,—

I. Because it is an infringement upon the prerogatives of God. The priest in the confessional is regarded as God, or God's representative in "the court of con-"science." Without undoubted authority from heaven, such an assumption partakes of the nature of blasphemy. Jehovah is the Lord of consciences. Against Him we have sinned, and to Him alone are we bound to confess. Thus David confessed, "Against thee, thee only, have I "sinned, and done this evil in thy sight," Psalm li. 4. Similar are the sentiments contained in Psalm xxxii. 5; cxxx. 4; Daniel ix. 3–9.

II. We are opposed to the confessional, on account of the power which it gives to the priesthood. They acquire a knowledge of all secrets and affairs, and exercise both an indirect and direct control.

1. The confessor employs an *indirect* influence. He knows, to a great extent, the secrets of a whole family and its transactions, even though there be but one member of that family under his spiritual guidance. A *governess*, a *servant*, or even a *child* in the house, who submits to his paternal direction, may communicate information, and accomplish his designs.

2. He also possesses a *direct* control. Surely the

man who bears the office of "God in the confessional," *Dens*, tom. vi. No. 160, is no ordinary being. As it has been well observed, "How can that man be resisted, "who, to force one to love him, can entice by the offer "of paradise, or frighten by the terrors of hell!" He knows all the secrets of every member. The daughter entrusts to him what, perhaps, she would not entrust to her mother. The wife whispers into his ear, kneeling by his side, aye, in *private*, what, peradventure, she would blush to acknowledge to the partner of her bosom! The priest is, in fact, the confidant even of the inmost thoughts, and he can turn that confidence to an account.

He can employ it for the advancement of his Church, and for his own purposes:

FOR THE CHURCH.

3. 'Tis true, the seal of the confessional cannot be broken, *lest*, as Liguori says on *the Seal*, confession should be rendered odious, or in other words, lest the people might be deterred from confessing. But the same *saint* says, that the confessor may obtain the licence of the penitent; and what devout Romanist, who is taught to regard the confessor as "God in the confessional," could refuse such licence for the purpose of serving "Mother Church?" The licence may be written or verbal.

It can be at once perceived, from the following incident, how the confessional may be employed:—

The kingdom of Sardinia, in 1850, passed the Siccardi Laws, to declare, among other things, that the Romish clergy should be amenable, in temporal matters, to the same tribunal as the laity. Soon afterwards, one of the ministers of state was taken ill, and having applied for, was refused the last rites of his, the Romish Church, because he would not acknowledge he had done wrong in the part he had taken in enacting these laws; and thus he died. (See *Lord John Russell's Speech on Papal Aggression*, 7th Feb. 1851.)

FOR HIS OWN PURPOSES.

4. The priest, bound by the unnatural law of celibacy, is placed at the head of a parish or congregation. All ages, of both sexes, repair to him and kneel at his side. It is not at all unlikely, that an avowal of love is the frequent subject of such confession, especially when the confessor is young, handsome, and popular. We would not enlarge upon a topic such as this, but we cannot refrain from observing what an immense power such a system affords to a wicked man of carrying out his designs, without danger of detection.

The Confessional Immoral.

III. Because it is immoral in its character and results. All mortal sins, and the circumstances which affect their character, must be detailed in the privacy of the confessional. There, mothers, daughters, and wives, kneel at the foot of the priest, and narrate their most secret thoughts and sins. Treatises on the nature of sin have been composed by Liguori, Dens, and others, for the guidance of the confessional,—treatises so polluted and filthy, that we do not use language too strong, when we say they are only fit for the abodes of hell.

"The Examination of Conscience," as prescribed in *The Garden of the Soul*, a well-known Romish prayer book, is full of the most obscene suggestions.

The Author has in his possession, a catechism, price one halfpenny, intended for *children*, and others before their admission to communion, entitled, "*Questions and "Answers on the Necessary Truths and Duties of Religion*," published by Richardson, Derby, 1843. Amongst the questions are the following, "What is fornication?" "What is adultery?" "What is incest?" The answers are given at length, to be committed to memory!!! They are unfit to be transferred to these pages. Such are the instructions which even children, who are confessed at an early age, receive, preparatory thereto. The author exposed this catechism at a public meeting in Nottingham, and the result was, that even

Rome blushed, and another edition shortly after appeared, with these obnoxious questions removed.

The immorality of the confessional arises from the very nature of the institution. It is a mortal sin for any one, even a female, to conceal anything in the confessional, from shame. Such concealment invalidates the absolution of the priest, and exposes the penitent to Divine wrath. Of this, *Saint Liguori*, who was canonized so recently as 1839, gives several instances, from which we select one:—

"Saint Antony relates, that there was a widow who began to lead a holy life; but afterwards, by familiarity with a young man, was led into sin with him. After her fall, she performed penitential works, gave alms, and even entered into a monastery, *but never confessed her sin.* She became abbess. She died, and died with the reputation of a saint. But, one night, a nun who was in the choir, heard a great noise, and saw a spectre encompassed with flames. She asked what it was. The spectre answered,—I am the soul of the abbess, and am in hell. And why? *Because*, in this world, I committed a sin, *and have never confessed it.* Go and tell this to the other nuns, and pray no more for me. She then disappeared amid great noise."—*Lig. on Com.*, p. 247. Dublin, 1844.

Here was a case, in which, according to Liguori, *one who died with the reputation of a saint*, was damned, notwithstanding her alms, works, and penitence; because she never confessed her sin!

Liguori admits the dangers of the confessional, and the immoral results which have flowed from it. In his *Praxis Confessarii*, he says,—

"A confessor ought to be exceedingly cautious in receiving the confessions of women; and in the first place is to be noted, what is said in the decree of the Sacred Congregation of Bishops, on the 21st January 1610. Confessors, without necessity, ought not to hear the confessions of women after evening twilight, or before morning. . . . . And he (Capotus) adds, that 'such persons do not immediately perceive this, since the devil does not always throw poisoned arrows, but only those which strike but lightly, and increase the affection. *But in a short time such persons come to this, that they no longer act towards each other as angels, as they commenced, but as those who are clothed in flesh; they interchange looks, and their minds are affected by soft expressions, which still seem to proceed from the first devotion; hence the one begins to long for the presence of the other, and thus (he concludes) the spiritual devotion is converted into carnal.*' AND INDEED, OH HOW MANY PRIESTS, WHO BEFORE WERE INNOCENT, ON ACCOUNT OF SIMILAR

ATTRACTIONS, WHICH BEGAN IN THE SPIRIT, HAVE LOST BOTH GOD AND THEIR SOUL! Here is to be observed what is prescribed according to the decree of the sacred congregation, that confessors, unnecessarily, ought not to hear the confessions of women after evening twilight, or before morning.

"120.—Moreover, the confessor ought not to be so addicted to the confessions of women, that on this account he would refuse to hear confessions of men who come to him. OH WHAT MISERY IT IS TO OBSERVE SO MANY CONFESSORS, WHO SPEND A LARGE PORTION OF THE DAY IN HEARING THE CONFESSIONS OF CERTAIN RELIGIOUS WOMEN, WHO ARE COMMONLY CALLED BIZOCAS, and when they afterwards observe men or married women coming to them, who are filled with cares and grievances, and who can scarcely leave their homes and business, dismiss them, saying, 'I have something else to do, go to some one else,'—whence it happens, that they not coming to confess their sins, live through whole months and years without the Sacraments and without God."—*Mor. Theol.*, vol. ix. p. 97. Venice, 1828.

Here, then, is a fact, admitted by the saint, that priests have lost their own souls, and those of their penitents, in this tribunal. This result is the natural consequence of Priestly Celibacy, and the unhallowed interrogations of the Confessional.

Questions and Answers.

1. *Q.*—Upon what is the practice of Auricular Confession based?

A.—Upon the supposed judicial power of the priest to forgive sin.

2. *Q.*—Some texts are quoted in favour of Auricular Confession. What do they prove?

A.—They prove either mutual or public acknowledgment of sin, but not that we are bound to whisper our sins into the ear of a priest.

3. *Q.*—Why do you object to Auricular Confession?

A.—Because it is an infringement upon the prerogative of the Most High.

4. *Q.*—Quote texts in order to show that we should confess our sins to God.

A.—Psalm li. 4; xxxii. 5; cxxx. 3, 4; Dan. ix. 3–9.

5. *Q.*—How prove you that it is immoral?

A.—Because the priest hears a recital of sins, and asks questions of a corrupting character. Sin and sin

only is the subject of conversation between the priest and the penitent.

6. *Q.*—Has it ever been admitted by eminent Roman Catholics, that the dangers of the Confessional are great, and that immorality has resulted from such confession?

A.—Yes. Liguori, a great saint, though he writes strongly in favour of the Confessional, admits and deplores the fact.

CHAPTER VIII.

Some of the Approved Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of Rome.

PART OF THE THIRD ARTICLE OF THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV.

"And I also receive and admit the received and approved ceremonies of the Catholic Church, used in the solemn administration of all the aforesaid sacraments."—*Extracted from the* "Ordo Administrandi Sacramenti," p. 66. London, 1831.

THE following Rites are prescribed in the *Pontificale Romanum*, for use in the Church of Rome. There are special services for the consecration of bishops, the ordination of door-keepers, readers, exorcists, acolythes, sub-deacons, deacons, and priests. From these, we select a few as a specimen*:—

Of the Ordination of Exorcists.

"For ordaining Exorcists, let there be at hand the Book of Exorcisms, instead of which can be given the Pontifical or Missal.

"After the chanting of the third lesson, the Pontiff sits, his mitre on; and the candidates being all arranged on their knees before him, with candles in their hands, he admonishes them, saying;—

"Dearly beloved sons, now about to be ordained to the office of Exorcists, you ought to know what it is that you are undertaking. *Now, it behoveth an Exorcist to cast out devils;* and to say to the people (*i. e.* the congregation), whosoever does not communicate, let him give place (*i. e.* leave the Church, go out), and to minister

* We refer, for more full information on this subject, to Mr Foye's work, which we recommend, entitled, *Romish Rites, Offices, and Legends*, which may be had on application to the Secretary of the Reformation Society, 20 Berners Street, London. We adopt Mr. Foye's translation.

the water in the Church-service. You, therefore, receive the power of laying hands upon *the possessed of devils;* through the laying on of your hands, unclean spirits are expelled, by the grace of the Holy Ghost and the words of exorcism, from the bodies that are possessed by them Be zealous, therefore, that, like as you expel devils from the bodies of others, so you cast out of your own minds and bodies all uncleanness and naughtiness; lest ye yield yourselves up to the same, whom, by your ministry, you cause to flee away out of others. Learn, through your office, to have the command over your vices; lest the enemy may be able to claim anything of his own in your morals. For it is then you will rightly have the command over other devils, when you first overcome their manifold iniquity in yourselves. The which, the Lord grant you to do, through His Holy Spirit.

"This done, the Pontiff takes and delivers to all of them the book in which the Exorcisms are written; in the stead of which can be given the Pontifical or Missal,—which they touch with their right hand (*Quem manu dextra tangunt*), while the Pontiff says:—

"Take ye this, and commit it to memory, and have ye the power of laying your hands on the possessed of devils, whether they be baptized, or catechumens.

"Next, all devoutly kneeling, the Pontiff standing with his mitre on, says:—

"Holy Lord, Almighty Father, eternal God, vouchsafe to hal + low these thy servants for the office of Exorcists: that, through the laying on of their hands, and the office of their mouth (*i. e.* the effectual words of exorcism), they may have the power and sovereign sway of coercing unclean spirits; they may be approved physicians of thy Church, being made strong in the grace of healings, and in heavenly might. Through our Lord," &c.—*Pont. Rom.*, First Part.

The Ordination of Priests.

After various directions as to numerous prayers and ceremonials, we find the following:—

"Then he (the bishop) turns to the altar, his mitre off, and all kneeling, he begins with a loud voice the chant *Veni Creator Spiritus;* with which the choir proceeds, and he sits down. The first verse of the hymn ended, he rises with mitre on; and, after he has taken off his gloves and put on his pontifical ring, his *gremial* (episcopal apron) is put on him; and they that are to be ordained successively kneeling, one by one, before him, he anoints, with the catechumenal oil, both the hands, joined together, of each one, in the form of a cross, thus—he draws, with his right hand thumb, after he has dipped it in the oil, two lines on the joined hands,—namely, one from the thumb of the right hand to the forefinger of the left hand, and another from the thumb of the left hand to the forefinger of the right; and then he anoints the palms all over, saying, whilst he anoints each one,—

"Vouchsafe, O Lord, to consecrate and sanctify these hands through this unction and our benediction. R. Amen.

"Here the Pontiff draws with his right hand the sign of the cross upon the hands of him whom he ordains, and proceeds:—

"That whatsoever they (the hands) hallow, may be hallowed; and whatsoever they consecrate, may be consecrated and sanctified, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.

"To which each one that is to be ordained answers, Amen.

"Then the Pontiff shuts up, or joins the hands of each one successively: *which, being thus consecrated,* one of the Pontiff's ministers ties them together with the white linen cloth, the one hand over the other,—namely, the right over the left; and forthwith each one returns to his place, *and keeps his hands thus shut and tied.* The hands of all being anointed and consecrated, the Pontiff wipes his thumb with the bread-pith. Then he delivers to each one successively, *a chalice with wine and water, and a paten with a host lying upon it;* they receive the latter (the host) between the fore and middle fingers; and they touch, at the same time, the bowl of the chalice, and the paten, while the Pontiff says to each one:—

"Receive thou power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate masses, both for the living and for the dead. In the name of the Lord. R. Amen."—*Ibid.*

The Consecration of Bishops.

The service is long, and full of the most puerile ceremonials. We give the following as a specimen:—

"When the first verse is finished, the Pontiff rises, and sits before the altar; puts on his mitre; takes off his ring and gloves; resumes his ring, and has his gremial put on him by the ministers. Then he dips his right thumb in the holy chrism, and anoints the head of the elect, who is on his knees before him, first forming the sign of the cross over his whole crown, and then anointing the rest of the crown, saying, the while:—

"Be thy head anointed and consecrated with heavenly benediction, in the Pontifical order.

"Then making the sign of the cross *thrice,* with his right hand, upon the head of the elect, he says,—

"In the name of the Fa+ther, and of the + Son, and of the Holy + Ghost. R. Amen.

"The anointing being finished, the Pontiff wipes his thumb *a little* in the bread-pith; and, when the hymn is ended, rises, having put off his mitre, and proceeds in his former tone [with the Preface]." Then follows a prayer.

"Then, during the chanting of the 133d Psalm with Antiphon, the other longer one of the eight little napkins is fastened to the neck of the elect. The consecrator sits down, having taken his mitre, and anoints both the hands, joined together, of the elect, with the chrism, in the form of the cross, by drawing lines with his right hand thumb,—namely, one line from the right hand thumb to the middle finger of the left hand, and the other from the left hand thumb to the middle finger of the right; then he anoints the palms all over, saying:—

"Let these hands be anointed with the sanctified oil and the

chrism of sanctification; like as Samuel anointed David King and Prophet, so be (these) anointed and consecrated;—here he draws the sign of the cross on the hands of the elect—in the name of the Fa+ther, and the + Son, and the Holy + Ghost, making (*i. e.* the hands) the image of the holy cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath redeemed us from death, and brought us to the kingdom of heaven . . . Through the same, &c. R. Amen.

"He proceeds, still sitting:—

"God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath willed thee to be exalted to the dignity of the Pontificate, himself overflow thee with the chrism and liquor of mystical unction, and enrich thee with the abundance of spiritual bene+diction; whatsoever thou shalt bless, let it be blessed; and whatsoever thou shalt sanctify, be it sanctified; and be the laying on of this thy consecrated hand or thumb profitable to all for salvation. R. Amen.

"The things preceding being thus finished, the *consecrated one* joins both his hands, and holds the right over the left, and folds them up in the napkin hanging from his neck.* But the consecrator wipes his thumb [again] a little in the bread-pith; and, putting off his mitre, rises, and blesses the pastoral staff (benedicit baculum pastoralem), if not blessed before,† saying,—*Sustentator imbecilitatis humanæ Deus, bene+dic baculum istum, &c.* 'God, the sustainer of human weakness, hal+low this staff,' &c.

"Then he sprinkles it with holy water. After which, taking his mitre and sitting down, he delivers (tradit) it to the consecrated, who is on his knees, and who *receives it between his fore and middle fingers, not disjoining his hands,* the consecrator saying,—

"Receive thou the staff of pastoral office; that thou be piously wrathful in correcting vices, keeping judgment without anger, soothing the minds of thy hearers by fostering their virtues, and not forsaking censure in the calmness of thy severity."—*Ibid.*

The Making of Holy Water in Laying the Foundation-Stone of a Church.

"The next day, the foundation-stone shall be blessed in the following manner:—The Pontiff, holding his pastoral staff in his

---

* Præmissis, itaque expeditis, *consecratus* jungit ambus manus. Up to the last mentioned rite, he is called *Electus*, or *consecrandus:* now he is called *consecratus;* the preceding rite, therefore, is, in the sense of the Church of Rome, the consecrating act; which the reader will remember is altogether a modern rite, as all the rites and forms onward from the prayer, Deus honorum omnium, are, some more and some less modern. They cannot, therefore, be in any true sense sacramental,—unless the Church can make true sacraments, which, it is admitted on all hands, she can *not.*

† If it had been blessed, it would, it seems, be sacrilege to bless it again, just as it would be sacrilege to baptize again; as though all these rites were sacramental. How fulsome! as if the learned world were still asleep; as was the case, when these rites were first devised and palmed upon the Church, as sacramental and essential!—Mr Foye.

left hand, standing, with his mitre on, in the place where the Church is to be built, blesses salt and water, saying,—

"I exorcise thee, thou creature of salt, by the living + God, by the true + God, by the holy + God; by the God who ordered thee to be cast into water by Elijah the prophet, that the unwholesomeness of the water might be healed; that thou be made exorcised salt, for the salvation of those that believe; and thou be to all that use thee, health of soul and body; and that, from the place where thou shalt be sprinkled, every spectre, and malice or subtlety of the devil's illusions, and every unclean spirit, flee away and depart, adjured by Him, who is to come to judge the quick and the dead, and the world by fire. R. Amen.

"I exorcise thee, thou creature of water, in the name of God the Fa+ther Almighty, and in the name of Jesus Christ his + Son our Lord, and in the might of the Holy + Spirit, that thou be conjured water, for putting to flight all the power of the enemy; and that thou avail to root out and banish the enemy himself, with his apostate angels, through the might of the same our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall come, &c. (as before). R. Amen."—*Pont. Rom.*, Second Part.

Holy Ashes.

Ashes are made holy in the following prayer:—

"O Almighty, everlasting God, spare the penitent, be propitious to thy suppliants, and vouchsafe to send thy holy angel from heaven, to hal+low and sancti+fy these ashes, that they be a healthful (saving) remedy to all humbly invoking thy holy name, and accusing themselves of their sins at the bar of conscience, lamenting their iniquities in the sight of thy Divine clemency, or suppliantly and earnestly importuning thy most gracious compassion: and grant, through the invocation of thy most holy name, that *whosoever shall sprinkle themselves with these ashes for the redemption of their sins*, may obtain health of body, and protection of soul, through Christ our Lord. R. Amen."—*Ibid.*

Holy Mortar.

In the service for the consecration of a church, we find the following direction:—

"The Preface ended, the Pontiff returns to the altar; and there, his mitre on, he makes mortar with the same holy water, and blesses it, saying,—

"O most high God . . . . sancti+fy and hal+low these creatures of lime and sand. Through Christ, &c."—*Ibid.*

Holy Incense.

In the same service, the following prayer is offered up:—

"O Lord God Almighty, before whom stands the army of angels trembling, whose service is known to be spiritual and fiery, vouchsafe to regard, hal+low, and sancti+fy this creature of incense;

that all spirits of diseases, and all spirits of infirmity, and the ensnaring emissaries of the enemy, smelling its odour, flee away, and be set aloof from this structure of thy forming (*i. e.* the altar), that what thou hast redeemed with the precious blood of thy Son, hurt by the bite of the old serpent. Through the same."—*Ibid.*

Holy Bells.

"A signal or bell must be hallowed before it is placed in the belfry, in this form:—In the first place, the bell is to be so suspended that it may be conveniently touched, inside and outside, handled and *circuited.* Next, near the bell, is prepared a faldstool; a vessel of water to be made holy,—a sprinkler,—a vessel of salt,—clean towels for wiping the bell when needful,—a vessel of holy oil of the sick,—holy chrism, perfumes, frankincense, myrrh, and a censer with fire. The Pontiff in vestments, &c., sitting on the faldstool, says with his ministering attendants [six Psalms in succession]. These ended, he rises, and standing in mitre, hallows the salt and water [with the same form as in page 95; to which the following Collect is added, to suit the holy mixture to the special purpose of hallowing the bell]:—

"Hal+low this water, O Lord, with thy heavenly hallowing; and the power of the Holy Ghost rest upon it; that when this instrument, designed for inviting the sons of holy Church, shall have been imbued therein; wheresoever this bell shall sound, thence may depart far away the power of the ensnarers, the shade of phantasms, the incursion of whirlwinds, the striking of lightnings, the hurtings of thunders, the calamity of tempests, and every sprite of storms; and that, when the sons of Christians shall hear its clang, the increase of devotion may so grow in them, that hastening to the bosom of holy mother Church, they may sing to thee, in the church, the new song of the saints, &c. Through, &c.

"The holy water being prepared, the Pontiff puts on his mitre, and *begins* to wash the bell with the said water. His ministering attendants take up and continue the work, washing it totally (*totaliter*, completely in every part) inside and outside; and afterwards wipe it with the clean linen; the Pontiff the while sitting in mitre, and saying with the rest of the ministers, the following six Psalms,—namely, from cxlv. to cl., inclusive.

"The Psalms being ended, the Pontiff rises in mitre, and with the thumb of his right hand makes outside, upon the bell, the sign of the cross, with the holy oil of the sick."—*Ibid.*

Holy Oil—The Devil driven out of Oil—Holy Chrism, and the Adoration of Chrism.

"This ended, the Pontiff sits, retaining his mitre, and *breathes fully three times* in the form of a cross over the mouth of the chrismal jar, still wrapped in the napkin. Next, the twelve vested priests come up in order, making a reverence to the sacrament on the altar, and to the Pontiff; and standing before the table, one by one, they successively *breathe*, in the same way as the Pontiff had done, over the mouth of the jar, in the form of a cross. Then

making a reverence again, as before, they return to their places —Which being done, the Pontiff rises, and standing in mitre, reads the chrismal exorcism, saying, *absolutely*—

"I exorcise thee, thou creature of oil, by God the Father Almighty, who made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that therein is; that all the might of the adversary, all the host of the devil, and all the incursion, and all the spectral power of Satan be rooted out, and put to flight from thee; so that thou be to all that shall be anointed of thee, for the adoption of sons by the Holy Ghost. In the name of God the Fa+ther Almighty, and of Jesus + Christ His Son our Lord, who with Him liveth and reigneth (as) God in the unity of the same Holy + Ghost."

"This Preface ended, the Pontiff puts back into the chrismal jar the mixture of balsam and oil, blending it with the same, and saying,—

"Be this mixture of liquors atonement to all that shall be anointed of the same, and the safeguard of salvation for ever and ever. R. Amen.

"Then the Deacon having taken away from the jar the napkin and silk cover, the *Pontiff taking off his mitre, and bowing his head, salutes the Chrism*, saying, HAIL, HOLY CHRISM!

"This he does a second, and a third time, raising his voice each time higher and higher, after which he *kisses* the lip of the jar. Which being done, each one of the twelve priests advances successively to the table, and, having made a reverence to the sacrament that is on the altar, and to the Pontiff sitting in mitre, kneels before the jar *three times*, each time at a different distance saying, at each kneeling, in a higher and higher tone, Hail, holy Chrism! And then reverently *kisses* the lip of the jar."—*Pont. Rom.*, Part Third.

Extreme Unction.

"Then having dipped the style, or his thumb, in the holy oil, he (the priest) anoints the sick in the form of the cross, in the parts hereinafter written, applying the words of the form to the particular place as follows:—

To the Eyes.

"The Lord, through this holy unction + and his own most gracious compassion, forgive thee whatsoever sin thou hast committed by seeing. Amen.

"This he does to each eye, repeating the same words. After each anointing he shall wipe the anointed places with a lump of *new* silk, or something similar, and *afterward burn the same* [*i. e.*, the silk, lest any unconsecrated hand should touch the holy thing!].

To the Ears.

"The Lord, &c., as before, whatsoever sin thou hast committed by *hearing*. Amen.

To the Nostrils.

"To each of which he applies the anointing in the same way, using the same words, only substituting for the last, *Per Odoratum*, By smelling. And so on to the rest, saying, at the anointing of

the mouth, *Per gustum et locutionem*, By tasting and talking; at each hand, *Per tactum*, By touching; and at each foot, *Per gressum*, By going."—*Rom. Ang. Ritual.*

These ceremonies and services approved by the Church of Rome—and they are but a *specimen*—bear their own refutation.

Observations.

Upon them we would make but three observations:—

I. How unreasonable and unscriptural is the notion, that the priest can make holy, insensible things, such as water, oil, salt, ashes, incense, chrism, and bells!

II. Romanism is a religion of ceremony, and is a departure from the purity and simplicity of the Gospel. Surely the Apostles never instituted or performed such rites!

III. Is it any wonder that Roman Catholic countries should be proverbially degraded, when mummeries and incantations such as the above are performed by the direction of the Roman Catholic Church?

CHAPTER IX.

Justification and Original Sin.

FOURTH ARTICLE OF THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV.

"I embrace and receive all and every one of the things which have been defined and declared in the Holy Council of Trent, concerning Original Sin and Justification."—*Extracted from the* "Ordo Administrandi Sacramenti," p. 66. Lond. 1831.

The way of salvation as taught by the Church of Rome, is one of the most fatal of her errors. Her system of justification is a complicated scheme, hard to be deduced from her formularies by even the learned student, and far beyond the reach of the unlettered man.

The way of salvation as taught in the Bible, by faith in a crucified Redeemer, is so plain, that he who runneth may read.

We charge the Church of Rome with obscuring that simple truth, by the addition of doctrines not found in the Word of God.

Romish Way of Salvation.

We shall endeavour to unfold the way of salvation as taught by Rome, in as brief and clear a manner as the subject will admit. The Council of Trent, on the subject of Original Sin, says,—

"If any person deny that the guilt of original sin is remitted by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ which is conferred in baptism, or even asserts that the *whole* of that which hath the true and proper nature of sin is not taken away; but says that it is only razed, or not imputed: let him be accursed.—But this Holy Synod confesses and thinks, that concupiscence, or lust, remains in the baptised. This concupiscence, which sometimes the apostle calls sin, the Holy Synod declares that the Catholic Church never understood to be called sin, because there is truly and properly sin in the regenerate, but because it arises out of sin and leads to sin. But if any one shall think the contrary,—let him be accursed."—P. 23, *Canons of Trent.* Paris, 1832.

Thus the Church of Rome teaches:—1. That the merit of Christ, or the benefit of His redemption, is given to infants and adults in baptism. 2. That baptism takes away original sin, both as to its guilt, or imputation, and existence. It restores the sinner to the state in which man was before the fall!

On the subject of justification, more particularly, she has passed several canons; amongst which are the following:—

"If any one shall say that the ungodly man is justified by faith only so as to understand that nothing else is required that may co-operate to obtain the grace of justification, and that it is in no wise necessary for him to be prepared and disposed by the motion of his *own* will,—let him be accursed."—*Canon* 9.

"If any one shall say that justifying faith is nothing else than confidence in the Divine mercy pardoning sins for Christ's sake; or that it is that confidence alone by which we are justified,—let him be accursed."—*Canon* 12.

"If any one shall say, that he who is once justified cannot sin, *nor lose* grace, ... let him be accursed."—*Canon* 23.

"If any one shall say, that justification received is not preserved, and also *increased* before God by good works: but that these works are only the fruits and marks of justification obtained, and not the cause of increasing the same,—let him be accursed."—*Canon* 24.

"If any one shall say, that the good works of a justified man are the gifts of God, in such a sense as not also to be the good merits *of* the justified man himself, *or* that the justified man, by the good works which are done by him through the grace of God and the merit of Jesus Christ, of whom he is a living member,

does not truly deserve increase of grace, eternal life, and the obtaining of eternal life itself, provided he shall die in a state of grace, and even an increase of glory,—let him be accursed."—*Canon* 32.

1. Thus she anathematises those who hold the doctrine of justification by faith only. 2. She teaches that grace, or the justified state may be lost. 3. That justification can be increased. 4. That good works are the merits of the justified person himself.

Penance, however, is intended only for mortal sin, which alone it is necessary to confess, in order to obtain pardon and restoration in that tribunal. Venial sin yet remains, and that is to be atoned for in this life by good works, by penitential exercises, and by indulgences, or by purgatory hereafter. We quote the following passage from a work on *Indulgences granted by Sovereign Pontiffs*, published in Dublin, 1845, p. 5 :—

"Sin produces two bitter fruits in the soul,—the guilt which deprives us of the grace and friendship of God; and the punishment which is due to it from His justice. This punishment is of two kinds,—the one eternal, and the other temporal. The guilt of sin, and the eternal punishment due to mortal sin, are remitted, through the infinite merits of Jesus Christ, in the holy Sacrament of Penance, provided we approach it with proper dispositions, or by perfect contrition, which should include a desire of confession; but all the temporal punishment is not generally forgiven in this sacrament. A portion of this punishment commonly remains to be atoned for in this life by good works, by penitential practices, and by indulgences; otherwise we shall suffer in the fire of purgatory, according to the satisfaction required by God's infinite justice. The motives of this atonement are, to keep us on our guard not to fall again into sin by the facility of pardon, and to co-operate by our penitential endeavours with the satisfactions and sufferings of Christ. *If we suffer with Christ, we may be also glorified with him* (Rom. viii. 17).

"An Indulgence is, therefore, the remission of the temporal punishment, which generally remains due to sins, already forgiven in the Sacrament of Penance as to the guilt and eternal punishment. This remission is made by the application of the merits and satisfactions, which are contained in the treasures of the Church. These treasures are the accumulation of the spiritual goods, arising from the infinite merits and satisfactions of Jesus Christ, with the superabundant merits and satisfactions of the Blessed Virgin Mary, of the holy martyrs, and of the other saints, which ultimately derive their efficacy from the merits and satisfactions of Christ, who is the only Mediator of redemption. These CELESTIAL TREASURES, as they are called by the Council of Trent, are committed, by the Divine bounty, to the dispensation of the

Church, the sacred spouse of Jesus Christ, and are the ground and matter of indulgences. They are infinite in regard to the merits of Christ, and cannot therefore be ever exhausted."

Romish Way of Salvation in brief.—The scheme of salvation as taught by the Church of Rome, is this:—Christ made an atonement for sin, and the benefits of His death are applied to the soul in the baptism whether of infants or adults. In the case of infants, no condition is required, so far as the infant is concerned; *but intention is necessary on the part of the priest.* In the case of adults, faith is required (not works), *and intention on the part of the priest.* In baptism, the soul is restored to its primitive condition, sinless; but this grace and justification may be diminished by venial sin, or lost by mortal. If the baptised commit mortal sin, a remedy is at hand. He must repair to "the court of justice,"—the tribunal of penance,—and there confess his sin, without reserve, to the priest, to whom, as judge, and "God in the confessional," is committed the power of absolving from the eternal punishment of sin. A temporal punishment, however, still remains, for absolution relates only to eternal punishment; and this, with venial sin, is to be atoned for by the sinner himself in various ways:—1. By indulgences; 2. Satisfaction; 3. Good works. Indulgences are obtained by scapulars, the repetition of certain prayers, and a multitude of such means. But if, notwithstanding all, venial sin or the temporal punishment of sin still remain, the soul is purged after death from all defilement, in purgatory, and then admitted into the regions of bliss.

Errors of the Scheme.—What a complicated scheme! Who could deduce from the Bible alone such a system as this?

Let us specify its errors:—1. In baptism, justification is given, and the soul restored to its original purity.*

* Cyprian, Chrysostom, and other Fathers, were unsound in their views as to justification and baptism.

Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, in the fifth century, was the great advocate for free grace; and though Rome has canonized Augustine, she has repudiated his views.

2. The intention of the priest is necessary for the validity of baptism. 3. If that intention be wanting, the grace of justification is not given. 4. Justification may be increased. 5. It may be lost. 6. Sin is distinguished into venial and mortal. 7. If the grace be lost by mortal sin, it is to be restored in the tribunal of penance by confession, absolution, and satisfaction. 8. The absolution of the priest restores the soul. 9. Venial sin is to be atoned for by good works of various kinds. 10. Good works are meritorious. 11. If venial sin, or temporal punishment, remain at the decease of the sinner who dies in grace, he must go through purgatory to heaven. Thus the doctrine of the Church of Rome on justification, involves a scheme extending from baptism to purgatory. Much of this scheme we have already refuted, in reference to the ideal tribunal of penance, and much will be refuted under other heads. If the

---

Augustine says,—"Let no one, therefore, deceive you, my brethren, because we should not love God unless He first loved us. The same John most clearly shows this, and says, 'We love Him because He first loved us.' Grace makes us the lovers of the law. But the law without grace only makes us pretenders. And what the Lord said to His disciples, 'Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you,' proves to us precisely the same thing. For if we first loved, so that He loved us on account of this merit, then we first chose Him so as to desire to be chosen by Him. But He, who is truth itself, said the reverse, and most openly contradicted this human vanity. He said, 'Ye have not chosen me.' If, therefore, they did not choose Him, undoubtedly they did not love Him; for how should they choose Him whom they did not love? But I, He says, 'have chosen you.' But did they not afterwards choose Him, and prefer Him to all earthly good? Yes; but they chose because they were chosen. They were not elected because they were previously chosen. There would be no such merit as that of human election, unless the grace of an electing God went first. Whence also the Apostle Paul, blessing the Thessalonians, says, 'The Lord make you to increase and abound in love one toward another, and toward all men, even as we do toward you.' He gave this blessing that we should love one another, who gave the law that we should love one another. Lastly, in another place, writing to the same, since undoubtedly that had taken place in some of them which he had desired should take place, he says, 'We are bound to thank God always for you, brethren, as it is meet, because that your faith groweth exceedingly, and the charity of every one of you all toward each other aboundeth.' He said this, lest by chance they should boast of so

scheme fail in any of its parts, it falls to the ground. We might therefore conclude at this point; but we shall proceed to show that it is false in some other of its points, reserving the consideration of the remainder to the proper place.

I. Baptism not Justification.—We maintain, that justification is not given in baptism; and that, in the case of adults, faith, and *therefore justification*, precede baptism. Everywhere throughout the Word of God, the partaking of spiritual blessedness, union and communion with Christ, are connected with faith. This we shall prove by and by, when showing that justification is by faith. The justification of infants by baptism is wholly without authority in the Bible.

II. Justification Complete.—Justification cannot be increased. It means the accounting of the sinner as righteous. It is the act by which God blots out the transgressions of him who believes and accepts him in

great a good which they had of God, as if they had it of themselves. We ought, therefore, he says, to return thanks, because your faith groweth exceedingly, and the charity of every one of you all toward each other aboundeth, and not to praise you as if you had this of yourselves.

"By these, and similar testimonies of the Word of God, the whole of which it would be tedious to quote, it is, I think, sufficiently proved that God works in the hearts of men to incline their wills whithersoever He pleaseth, whether to good works, according to His mercy, or to bad works, according to their merits; by His own judgment, sometimes apparent, and sometimes concealed, but always just. For it ought to be immoveably settled in your hearts, that there is no iniquity in God. For this reason, when you read in the Word of Truth that men are led astray by God, or that their hearts are blunted or hardened, doubt not that their demerits preceded this, so that they justly suffered those things: lest you expose yourself to that proverb of Solomon, 'The foolishness of man perverteth his way, and his heart fretteth against God.' But grace is not given according to man's merits, else grace would be no longer grace: it is called grace expressly because it is gratuitously given. But if He is powerful to work even in the hearts of the wicked, by good or bad angels, or any other way, according to their merits, whose malignity He did not form, but which was either originally drank from Adam, or augmented by their own will, ought it to surprise us, if He, by the Holy Spirit, works good in the hearts of His elect, who have caused their hearts, which were evil, to become good?"—*Lib. de Grat.*, tom. x. p. 724. Bened. Edit.

the Beloved. God requires righteousness, which means the perfect fulfilment of the law of God, in the spirit as well as the letter of that law. But "all have sinned, "and come short of the glory of God," Romans iii. 23, and in the strict sense, "there is none righteous, no not "one," Romans iii. 10. "The wages of sin is death," Romans vi. 23. That death we have all merited; but Christ obeyed the law, and "made it honourable." He has kept all its requirements; and His "obedience unto 'death," His blood and righteousness, constitute our title to heaven. God is well pleased with His Son, Matt. iii. 17; and well pleased with all who are in Him. The believer is complete in Christ, Col. ii. 10. Christ's righteousness is His. He has obeyed the law in Christ, who is made of God unto us "wisdom, and righteous-"ness, and sanctification, and redemption," 1 Cor. i. 30. That righteousness is imputed to the sinner the moment he believes, and he is regarded as though it were his own. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting 'life," John iii. 36. Justification cannot be increased, for the righteousness which gives the believer his title, admits of *no increase*. It is finished, John xix. 30; it is perfect, Heb. v. 9. Sanctification, or the inward work of the Holy Spirit on the soul, may be increased, and this Rome confounds with justification.

III. Justification Everlasting.—Justification cannot be lost, for the *title* of the believer, the righteousness of Christ, cannot be diminished, no more than it can be increased. The believer is justified by the imputation of an *everlasting* righteousness, Dan. ix. 24, and hence, *for ever*. None can take him from Christ.

Christ says,—

John 10. 28. And I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand. V 29. My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all; and no man is able to pluck *them* out of my Father's hand.

And the Apostle Paul says,—

Philip. 1. 6. Being confident of this very thing, that he which hath begun a good work in you, will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ.

(See also Romans v. 9, 10; viii. 30-39.)

IV. No Merit in Works.—Good works are not meritorious:—

Isaiah 64. 6. But we are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags; and we all do fade as a leaf; and our iniquities, like the wind, have taken us away.

Psalm 130. 3. If thou, Lord, shouldest mark iniquities, O Lord, who shall stand? V 4. But there is forgiveness with thee, that thou mayest be feared.

Psalm 143. 2. And enter not into judgment with thy servant; for in thy sight shall no man living be justified.

Jacob (Genesis xxxii. 10); Job (Job xlii. 6); David (Psalm li. 3); Paul (1 Tim. i. 15); and John (1 John i. 8), admit their sinfulness; and the heavenly hosts ascribe all praise to the Lamb (Rev. vii. 10).

V. Faith Justifies.—Not baptism—not penance—not purgatory—but faith only is the instrument by which we are justified:—

Acts 16. 31. And they said, *Believe* on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house.

Romans 3. 28. Therefore we conclude, that *a man is justified by faith* without the deeds of the law.

Romans 5. 1. Therefore, *being justified by faith*, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.

Ephes. 2. 8. For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: V 9. Not of works, lest any man should boast.

(See also John iii. 16-36; Acts xiii. 39; Gal. ii. 16-21; Philip. iii. 9.)

VI. Works are the Fruits of Justification.—Good works are the evidences and fruits of salvation, not in any wise the cause. "By their fruits ye shall know "them," Matt. vii. 20.

Romans 4. 5. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, *his faith* is counted for righteousness. V 6. Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works.

Romans 10. 3. For they, being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God.

Romans 11. 6. And if by grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work.

Gal. 3. 11. But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for, The just shall live by faith.

2 Tim. 1. 9. Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy

calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began.

Titus 3. 5. Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.

(See also Acts xiii. 39; Romans iii. 28; xi. 35; Gal. ii. 16-21; Philip. iii. 9.)

The way of salvation taught by Rome is a maze, and delusive, and cruel.

It is cruel; for the grace of baptism or justification is made to depend upon the intention of the priest.

His intention is necessary in Baptism.

The bishop's intention is necessary in Confirmation.

The priest's intention is also necessary in Penance, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction.

What Roman Catholic can be assured that he is justified, or that he has grace at all, since, if the priest do not intend to do what he professes to do, the grace of the sacraments is not given? And yet Rome lays claim to infallibility! What a cruel delusion!

The Bible points to Christ only, and tells us that salvation is by faith in Him.

Faith itself is the gift of God,—"For by grace are ye "saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is "the gift of God," Ephes. ii. 8,—and not meritorious. We are justified not *for* our faith, but *by* our faith, which is but the hand that lays hold on Christ.

Good works are the result of a saved state; but their reward is of grace, *not of debt*. "Christ is all and in "all," Col. iii. 11.

Let us cast our crowns in the dust, and ascribe to Him the praise for ever!

Questions and Answers.

1. *Q.*—What does the Church of Rome teach as to the efficacy of baptism?

A.—That it takes away original sin, and restores the soul to its original purity.

2. *Q.*—Specify, in general, some of the errors of the Romish system of justification.

A.—It is supposed, 1. That justification is effected by baptism. 2. That justification can be increased. 3. That justification can be lost. 4. That good works are meritorious.

3. *Q.*—Why do you object to the doctrine of justification by baptism?

A.—Because justification or salvation is always connected in the Word of God with faith, and not with the mere performance of a rite, John iii. 16-36; Rom. v. 1.

4. *Q.*—What does justification mean?

A.—The accounting of the sinner as righteous, or that act by which God blots out the transgressions of him who believes, and accepts him in the Beloved.

5. *Q.*—What is righteousness?

A.—It means the perfect fulfilment of the law of God.

6. *Q.*—Is any man righteous in the strict sense?

A.—No. "There is none righteous, no, not one," Romans iii. 10.

7. *Q.*—If man have not righteousness, can he be saved by any act of his own?

A.—No; for it is written, "Cursed is every one that "continueth not in all things which are written in the "book of the law to do them," Gal. iii. 10.

8. *Q.*—What, then, is the way of salvation, seeing that the sinner has no righteousness to offer?

A.—Christ, by His obedience unto death, has wrought out a righteousness for those who believe. The Apostle says, "But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is "made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sancti-"fication, and redemption," 1 Cor. i. 30. The same truth is taught in other portions; for example, Romans x. 3, 4; Philip. iii. 9. Christ's righteousness is the believer's title to heaven. The believer, washed in the blood of the Lamb, and arrayed in Christ's spotless obedience, is complete, Col. ii. 10. It is therefore written, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved," Acts xvi. 31.

9. *Q.*—Can justification be increased?

A.—No; for Christ's righteousness admits of no increase.

10. *Q.*—Can justification be lost?

A.—No; for Christ's righteousness, for which the sinner is accepted, is everlasting, Daniel ix. 24. "It is "finished," John xix. 30; Romans viii. 35-39.

11. *Q.*—Are works meritorious?

A.—No. Isaiah lxiv. 6; Psalm cxxx. 3, 4.

12. *Q.*—Is holiness necessary?

A.—Yes; as the evidences and fruits of salvation, but in no wise as the *cause*, Titus iii. 5.

CHAPTER X.

Transubstantiation not Proved by the Bible.

(PART FIRST.)

FIFTH ARTICLE OF THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV.

"I profess likewise, that in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead. And that in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist, there are truly, really, and substantially the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood; which conversion the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation. I also confess, that under either kind alone, Christ is received whole and entire, and a true sacrament."—*Extracted from the* "Ordo Administrandi Sacramenti," p. 67. London, 1840.

THIS article relates to three subjects:—the Sacrifice of the Mass, Transubstantiation, and Communion in One Kind. We shall first direct our attention to the dogma of transubstantiation, as on it is founded the sacrifice of the mass.

Transubstantiation as taught by Rome.—The word transubstantiation means *a change of substance*. The Church of Rome teaches, that the substance of bread and wine are changed into the literal body and blood of Christ. The Council of Trent says,—

"*Canon* 1.—If any one shall deny that the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and

therefore entire Christ, are truly, really, and substantially contained in the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist; and shall say that He is only in it as in a sign, or in a figure, or virtually,—let him be accursed."

Thus the Church of Rome curses the man who denies that the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of Christ, are truly, really, and substantially contained in the sacrament of the Eucharist. But she goes even further. The same Council teaches,—

"*Canon* 2.—If any one shall say that the substance of the bread and wine remains in the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist, together with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and shall deny that wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, the outward forms of the bread and wine still remaining, which conversion the Catholic Church most aptly calls transubstantiation,—let him be accursed."

Lest it might be held that the elements of bread and wine remain in their natural substances *with* the body and blood of Christ, she hurls a curse at him who denies the wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood! But she goes even still further. The same Council says,—

"*Canon* 3.—If any one shall deny, that in the venerated sacrament of the Eucharist, entire Christ is contained in each kind, and in each several particle of either kind when separated,—let him be accursed."

Thus, if the consecrated bread be severed into a thousand parts, or into a million crumbs, each part or crumb is entire Christ! If the wine be divided into numberless drops, each drop is entire Christ—body, soul, and divinity! The Church of Rome goes further still. The Council of Trent says,—

"*Canon* 4.—If any one shall say that, after consecration, the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ is only in the wonderful sacrament of the Eucharist in use whilst it is taken, and not either before or after, and that the true body of the Lord does not remain in the hosts or particles which have been consecrated, and which are reserved, or remain after the communion,—let him be accursed."

This is explicit enough. The body and blood of our Lord is not only in the "wonderful sacrament" when taken, but the true body of our Lord remains in the

hosts or particles which have been consecrated, and are reserved or remain after communion. The Catechism of the Council of Trent teaches that,—

"Not only the true body of Christ, and whatever appertains to the true mode of existence of a body, as *the bones and nerves*, but also that entire Christ is contained in this sacrament."—*On the Sacrament of the Eucharist*, p. 241. Venice, 1582.

The Host worshipped with Latria.—In accordance with this dogma, the Church of Rome teaches, that the host is to be worshipped with the open worship of *latria*,—Divine honour,—according to her own exposition; and she *does* worship it in the Mass:—

"*Canon* 6.—If any one shall say that Christ, the only begotten Son of God, is not to be adored in the holy sacrament of the Eucharist, even with the open worship of latria, and therefore not to be venerated with any peculiar festal celebrity, nor to be solemnly carried about in processions according to the praiseworthy and universal rites and customs of the holy Church, and that he is not to be publicly set before the people to be adored, and that His adorers are idolaters,—let him be accursed."

Is the host, we ask, the Christ, the Lord of glory—the God-man? or is it not? This is the question. We answer, It is not; and believing that it is mere flour and water, we refuse to adore it. The Church of Rome answers that it is, and makes it the great object of her worship in the Mass.

Romish Arguments adduced in favour of this monstrous dogma:—

Certain passages of Scripture are quoted by Romanists on this subject, to which we shall direct attention. We would however premise, that some of the most eminent Roman Catholics admit that Scripture does not prove this doctrine. They suppose that it rests on the authority of the Church.

Admissions of Romanists.—Scotus, professor of Divinity of Oxford, in 1301, called the "Subtle Doctor," says distinctly, that *before the Council of Lateran*, transubstantiation was not an *article of faith*. He also maintained, that there was no place of Scripture express enough to prove that dogma *without* Church authority. —*Bell.* lib. 3, *De Euch.*, cap. 23, sect. 12, p. 33, tom. 3.

Suaresius, the Jesuit, says,—

"From the doctrine of faith it is collected, *that those schoolmen are to be corrected,* who teach that this doctrine, concerning this conversion or transubstantiation, is NOT VERY ANCIENT, *amongst whom are Scotus and Gabriel Biel.*"—P. 594. Mogunt, 1610.

The Roman Catholic Bishop Tonstal says,—

"Of the manner and means of the real presence, how it might be either by transubstantiation or otherwise, perhaps it had been better to leave any one, who would be curious, to his *own opinion, as before the Council of Lateran it was left.*"—*De Euch.* lib. i. p. 46.

Gabriel Biel, the great commentator, in the 14th century, says,—

"*How* the body of Christ is in the sacrament, is not expressed in the canon of the Bible."—*Lect.* vi., fol. 94. Basil, 1515.

Cardinal de Alliaco says,—

"That manner and meaning which supposeth *the substance of bread to remain,* IS POSSIBLE; neither is it contrary to reason, nor to the authority of the Scripture; *nay, it is more easy and more reasonable to conceive,* if it could only accord with the Church."—Fol. ccxvi. Paris.

Such is the candid admission of learned Roman Catholics.

Romish Arguments Refuted.—Let us now inquire the meaning of passages adduced in favour of transubstantiation.

The 6th chapter of John is quoted,—

John 6. 53. Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. V 54. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. V 55. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. V 56. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.

The Romanist argues from this, that the believer feeds upon the literal flesh and blood of Christ in the Eucharistic bread and wine.

I. We answer, that this passage has no direct reference to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The discourse recorded in the chapter, was delivered at least thirteen months before the institution of the Lord's Supper. This is evident from the fact, that two passovers (the passover was a yearly feast) elapsed between

the delivery of these words, and the institution of the sacrament (John vi. 4, compared with John xii. 1). But Christ uses the present tense, "Except *ye eat.*" It was their duty to partake of that spiritual food even at the time when He delivered the discourse. Therefore the words cannot refer to the sacrament, which was not then instituted.

II. The passage must be understood either literally or figuratively. *It is not received in the absolutely literal sense by Rome herself.* She only goes as far as suits her purpose in her literal interpretation.

1. Jesus said, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of "man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." This, if referred to the sacrament and understood literally, would prove that all who do not receive that sacrament must perish! Then infants are lost. Indeed, some in the ancient Church, thinking that Christ alluded to the Eucharist, administered it to infants, believing that without it they could not be saved. Let Rome be consistent, and, teaching that the sacrament is absolutely necessary to salvation, give it to infants.

If this passage be understood literally, no layman has life, for he is deprived of the cup. Christ says, "Except "ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his "blood, ye have no life in you."

They answer, that they receive the blood in the wafer. Of what use, then, is the cup at all? But granting this for argument sake, they do not literally *drink the blood*, for they cannot *drink the wafer!*

The *Bohemians*, in the 14th century, thinking that this passage referred to the sacrament, took up arms, and compelled the Church of Rome to give them the cup. It is now, however, withdrawn.

2. Jesus said, "Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh "my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up "at the last day" (ver. 54).

This, if understood literally, would prove that all communicants are saved, which the Church of Rome admits is not the case.

3. Jesus said, "I am the living bread which came "down from heaven" (ver. 51).

If this be understood literally, it would prove that Christ's flesh came down from heaven, which would contradict the truth that He was "born of the Virgin "Mary."

4. If the passage be understood literally, it would prove that there are two ways of salvation,—one by the sacrament, and the other by faith.

(1.) "He that eateth of this bread shall live for ever," (ver. 58). (2.) "He that *believeth* on the Son, hath "everlasting life," John iii. 36.

III. The declaration must be received figuratively. It refers to the *one* way of salvation by faith. The 35th verse is a key to the interpretation of the chapter,— "He that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that "believeth on me shall never thirst." How are we to feed on Christ?—By coming to Him. How are we to drink His blood?—By believing on Him.

The Saviour explains His meaning clearly:—

John 6. 62. What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before? V 63. It is *the Spirit* that quickeneth: the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.

We quote Augustine's words on this passage; not because his comment contains any peculiar weight, but because Rome *professes* to reverence his authority:—

"If a passage is perceptive, and either forbids a crime or wickedness, or enjoins usefulness or charity, it is not figurative. But if it seems to command a crime or wickedness, or to forbid usefulness or kindness, *it is figurative.* 'Unless ye shall eat,' he says, 'the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye shall not have life in you.' He appears to enjoin wickedness, or a crime. *It is a figure*, therefore, teaching us that we partake of the benefits of the Lord's passion, and that we must sweetly and profitably treasure up in our memories, that His flesh was crucified and wounded for us."—*The Third Book upon Christian Doctrine*, vol. iii. p. 52. Benedictine Edit. printed at Paris, 1685.

The Jesuit Maldonatus admits, that this passage from Augustine is in accordance with the Protestant interpretation; but says,—

"Although I have no author for my exposition but myself, yet

I allow it rather than Augustine's, *although his be most probable;* because this of mine doth more cross the sense of Calvinists."—P. 1501. Lugd., 1615.

Christ says, "What and if ye shall see the Son of "man ascend up where he was before." As though He had said, You think that I speak of my flesh, but my body shall ascend into heaven, far beyond the reach of being eaten by man. "The flesh profiteth nothing:" Even though you were to partake of my body, it would not save your souls. "The words that I speak unto "you, they are spirit, and they are life:" They have a spiritual signification, and they show that you must feed on me by *faith;* for "he that cometh to me shall never "hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never "thirst."

Jesus constantly used figurative language in order to enforce the truths which He taught; and this discourse proves, that a bare profession of truth will not do, but that we must be really partakers of spiritual blessings, and feed thereon, and grow.

Instances of such figurative language are found also in Isaiah lv. 1-3; John vii. 37-39; Matt. xvi. 5-11.

The Words of Institution.

The words of institution are also quoted:—

Luke 22. 14. And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the twelve apostles with him. V 15. And he said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer: V 16. For I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God. V 17. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves: V 18. For I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come. V 19. And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body, which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. V 20. Likewise also the cup after supper, saying. This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you.

1. Feast Commemorative, as was the Passover.—The very occasion will explain the words. It was at the paschal feast that Christ instituted the sacrament. The paschal lamb *commemorated* the passover, or the

Lord's having passed over the children of Israel, Exod. xii., and yet the lamb was called "*the passover*." When Christ said, "*This* passover," ver. 15, He meant *this commemoration* of the passover; and He could not mean that it was literally the passover, for that would have been contrary to fact. In like manner, He said, "This "is my body." At a commemorative feast, He institutes another commemorative ordinance, which was to supersede the former, and to be observed "in *remem-* "*brance* of him."

2. Apostolic Reception of Christ's Words.—The Apostles, it is evident, understood our Lord as we do. They were accustomed to figurative language, in which the Saviour constantly spoke, and which was the current language of the day. They knew that the words, "This "passover," did not mean the literal passover, and likewise that the words, "This is my body," did not mean the literal body, but the commemoration of it. They did not believe that Christ, whom they saw, and with whom they spoke, took His own body, in His own hands, and broke it into twelve parts, each part being a whole body, and gave His flesh and blood to them to eat! It was contrary to the law of God, as we shall prove by and by, to drink blood, and much more human blood. The Apostles surely did not suppose that they were thus violating the law. No exclamation escapes from their lips. Peter was ever forward in asking an explanation when such was needed,—but none was needed now: which plainly proves, that they did not receive the Lord's words in the monstrous sense of Rome.

3. The Feast Commemorative from Christ's Words.—The words, "Do this in *remembrance of me*," and the apostolic declaration, "For as often as ye eat "this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's "death till *he* come," 1 Cor. xi. 26, plainly prove, that the sacrament commemorates the Saviour, who is bodily absent.

How could it be done in *remembrance* of Him, if He were present in body, blood, soul, and deity? How

could it be said, that "we show the Lord's death *till* he come," if He were already come literally upon the altar?

4. The Words themselves Refute Transubstantiation.—Christ distinctly calls the wine "*the fruit of* "*the vine*," Luke xxii. 18; and the Apostle repeatedly calls the sacramental elements, "bread" and "the "cup:"—

1 Cor. 11. 26. For as often as ye eat *this bread*, and drink this cup. V 27. Whosoever shall eat *this bread*, and drink this cup. V 28. And so let him eat of *that bread*, and drink of that cup.

Now the Church of Rome does not receive their declaration literally, but in a non-natural sense (the bread, she says, is not bread), in order to support the monstrous tenet of transubstantiation.

5. Apostolic Account refutes Transubstantiation.—The apostolic account is destructive of this dogma:—

1 Cor. 11. 23. For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread: V 24. And, when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. V 25. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. V 26. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come.

Christ said, "This cup is the new testament."

Now, here is a *double figure of speech*. First, the cup is put for the wine, and, secondly, the wine is called the new testament. We ask, Was the cup literally transubstantiated into the new testament or covenant?

The Apostle says, "*After the same manner* also he took "the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the "new testament in my blood."

"After the same manner" that he had said "This is "my body," He said "This cup is the new testament "in my blood:"

But He did not say or mean that the cup was literally the new testament;

Therefore he did not mean that the bread was literally His body.

6. The Church of Rome Inconsistent with Herself.—To insist upon the literal interpretation, is contrary to common use, and to the practice of the Church of Rome in *other* respects, and to common sense. One friend says to another, pointing to the statue of the great Scottish reformer, "This is John Knox." Who would therefore argue that the substance of the stone was changed into the flesh and blood of that great man! In everyday life, we call the commemoration by the name of the thing commemorated. It is contrary also to the practice of the Church of Rome in other respects. The Scripture calls the consecrated elements bread and the fruit of the vine. She does not receive the literal interpretation in this case, though that interpretation would be accordant with right reason.

Jacob said,—

Gen. 49. 9. Judah *is* a lion's whelp.

Was Judah, therefore, transubstantiated into the cub of a lion?

Gen. 49. 14. Issachar *is* a strong ass.

Was Issachar, therefore, literally converted into a donkey?

Rom. 3. 13. Their throat *is* an open sepulchre.

Is the human throat, therefore, changed into a yawning tomb?

Psalm 119. 105. Thy word *is* a lamp unto my feet.

Is the Word of God, therefore, transubstantiated into a lamp?

Isa. 40. 6. All flesh *is* grass.

Is every man, woman, and child, therefore, converted into grass?

Dan. 7. 17. These great beasts, which are four, *are* four kings.

Were the four kingdoms of Babylon, Medo-Persia, Macedon, and Rome, with their cities, towns, and territories, changed into four beasts?

John 10. 9. I am the door.

Did Christ mean that He was literally a door?

John 15. 1. I am the true vine.

Was Christ, therefore, a literal vine?

1 Cor. 10. 4. That Rock was Christ.

Was Christ, therefore, the rock in the wilderness?

Many other such instances might be given, in which it would be contrary to Rome herself, and to all common sense, to insist upon literal interpretation.

1 Cor. xi. 29 is also quoted,—

1 Cor. 11. 29. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body.

It is argued, that the Lord's body must be there.

1. We ask, Do the Romanists themselves literally discern the Lord's body?

2. Similar is St Paul's declaration to the Galatians,—

Gal. 3. 1. O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, *crucified among you?*

It is asked, How can we discern the Lord's body, if it be not present? We ask, How could the Galatians crucify Christ afresh, if He were not brought down from heaven, and nailed literally to the cross again?

Christ was crucified among them by the clear exhibition of truth (the Romanist will be constrained to admit); for no one will say, that He was crucified literally a second time. And the Corinthians discerned not the Lord's body, when, by their unworthy reception of the sacrament, they disregarded His body and the benefits procured by His body and blood, of which the sacrament was the commemoration,—"For as often as "ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death *till he* come," 1 Cor. xi. 26.

Questions and Answers.

1. *Q.*—What is the doctrine of the Church of Rome as to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper?

A.—She teaches, that the bread and wine are truly, really, and substantially converted into the body, blood, soul, and deity of Christ.

2. *Q.*—Does she give religious worship to the host, or consecrated wafer?

A.—Yes. The Council of Trent directs that *latria*, which she regards as the highest kind of worship, shall be given to it

3. *Q.*—What passages of Scripture are quoted in support of this dogma?

A.—The discourse recorded in the 6th chapter of St John. The words of institution, 1 Cor. xi. 23–28.

4. *Q.*—What answer do you give to the first?

A.—I prove, (1.) That it can have no direct reference to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, because it was not then instituted, and the Saviour uses the present tense. (2.) The passage, if received literally, would prove that no one can be saved who does not receive the sacrament, and that all shall be saved who do. (3.) The Lord himself explains the passage, saying, that His words are spiritual (v. 63). We feed on Christ by coming to, and believing upon Him (v. 35).

5. *Q.*—How do you explain the words of institution, "This is my body?"

A.—It is evident that they are figurative, signifying the commemoration of Christ's body. (1.) The sacrament was instituted at a commemorative feast—the passover. (2.) It would have been contrary to the law of God to drink blood, and much more human blood. (3.) Christ says, "This do in *remembrance* of me." (4.) Christ calls the wine "the fruit of the vine," Luke xxii. 18; and the Apostle frequently calls the consecrated element, "bread," 1 Cor. xi. 26, 28. (5.) The Apostle states, After the same manner that He said "This cup is the New Testament," so He said "This "is my body:" but the cup is not literally the New Testament; therefore the bread is not literally the body. (6.) The literal acceptation of the words would be contrary to common sense and use.

6. *Q.*—How do you answer the argument founded on 1 Cor. xi. 29?

A.—(1.) By showing that the Romanist himself does

not literally discern the Lord's body in the sacrament. (2.) And that as well might it be argued, that Christ was *literally* crucified amongst the Galatians, Gal. iii. 1, as literally discerned in the Lord's Supper.

CHAPTER XI.

Transubstantiation—The Uncertainty of Consecration—The Poisoned Host—Idolatry.

(PART SECOND.)

FIFTH ARTICLE OF THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV.

"I profess likewise, that in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead. And that in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist, there are truly, really, and substantially the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood; which conversion the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation. I also confess, that under either kind alone, Christ is received whole and entire, and a true sacrament."—*Extracted from the* "Ordo Administrandi Sacramenti," p. 67. London, 1840.

THE Church of Rome, we have seen, teaches, that intention on the part of the priest, is necessary in the administration of the Sacraments. If the priest want the intention of doing what he professes to do, consecration is invalid, and the people worship the works of their own hands. Intention, and other defects which may occur, are referred to in the *Roman Missal*, as follows:—

"*Of Defects occurring in the celebration of the Mass.*

"The priest about to celebrate mass, must take the utmost care that there be no defect in any of the things that are requisite for the making the sacrament of the Eucharist. Now a defect may occur on the part of the matter to be consecrated; on that of the form to be applied; and on that of the minister celebrating. If there is a defect in any of these: namely, the due matter, the form with intention, and the sacerdotal order of the celebrant, it nullifies the sacrament.

"II.—*Of Defects in the Matter.*

"There is defect in the matter, if any of those things be wanting, which are requisite to the same. For it is requisite that the bread be wheaten, and the wine, of the pure grape; and that this

matter be, in order to be consecrated, before the priest (*i. e.*, in his eye) in the act of consecrating.

"III.—*Of Defects in the Bread.*

"If the bread be not wheaten; or if wheaten, yet if it be mixed with any other sort of grain in such quantity, that it no longer remains wheaten bread; or if it be in any other respect corrupted, —there is no sacrament.

"2. If it be made with rose water, or any other distilled water, it is doubtful whether there is a sacrament.

"3. If it (the bread) has begun to corrupt, but is not corrupt; also if it be not unleavened, according to the custom of the Latin Church, the sacrament is made, but the celebrant sins grievously."

"7. If the host after consecration disappear, either by any accident, as by the wind, or a miracle, or being taken and carried off by any animal; and if it cannot be recovered, then he shall consecrate another, beginning at the words, Who the day before he suffered—having first made the oblation of it.

"IV.—*Of Defect in the Wine.*

"1. If the wine has become quite sour, or quite putrid, or has been pressed from sour or unripe grapes, or have so much water mixed with it, that the wine is corrupted; the sacrament is null."

"V.—*Of Defects in the Form.*

"1. Defects may occur in the form, if any of those things be wanting, which are required to the entireness of the words in the consecration. Now the words of consecration, which are the form of this sacrament, are these;—*For this is my body; and, For this is the chalice of my blood of the new and eternal Testament: the mystery of faith which shall be shed for you, and for many, for the remission of sins.* Now, if any one should diminish or change anything of the form of consecration of the body and the blood, and by such change, the words should not signify the same thing: he would not make the sacrament But if he should add anything which did not change the signification; he would make the sacrament, it is true; but he would sin most grievously."

"VI.—*Of Defects in the Minister.*

"Defects may occur on the part of the minister, in respect of those things that are required in the same. Now these are: first of all, intention, and next, disposition of soul, disposition of body, disposition of vestments, and disposition in the ministration itself, in respect to the things (*i. e.*, the defects) that can occur in the same.

"VII.—*Of Defect of Intention.*

"1. If any one does not intend to make (the sacrament) but to do something delusively: Item, if any wafers remain forgotten on the altar, or any part of the wine, or any wafer escape his notice, when he intends to consecrate only those which he sees: Item, if one have before him eleven wafers, and intends to consecrate only ten, not determining what ten he intends; in these cases he does not consecrate, inasmuch as intention is essential. It is otherwise, if thinking that there are ten, but yet he means to con-

secrate all that he has before him, for then all will be consecrated; and therefore every priest ought always to have such intention,—namely, that of consecrating all that he has placed before him for consecration."

"VIII.—*Of Defects in Disposition of Soul.*

"1. If any one celebrate, who is suspended, excommunicated, degraded, irregular, or otherwise canonically hindered, true he makes the sacrament, but he sins most grievously, as well in regard to the communion, which he takes unworthily, as because he executes the office of orders, which was interdicted him.

"2. If any one having opportunity of a confessor celebrates in mortal sin, he sins grievously.

"3. If any one in a case of necessity, not having a confessor within reach, celebrate without contrition in mortal sin, he sins grievously. It is otherwise if he be contrite: he ought, however, to confess as soon as possible.—[And so on in Nos. 3 and 4.]

"IX.—*Of Defects in Disposition of Body.*

"1. If any one has broken his fast since midnight, even though by taking water only, or any other drink, or food, even by way of medicine, and in however small a quantity, he cannot communicate, or celebrate."

"X.—*Of the Defects occurring in the Ministration itself.*

"Defects also may occur in the ministration itself, if any of the things be wanting that are requisite to the same; as, for instance, if the celebration be made in a place not sacred, or not appointed by the bishop, or on an altar not consecrated, or not covered with three altar-cloths: if there be not present waxen lights: if it be not the due time of massing, which is commonly from dawn to mid-day: if the celebrant has not said at the least matins and lauds: if he omit any of the sacerdotal vestments: if the sacerdotal vestments and altar-cloths be not blessed by a bishop, or other having this power (granted him): if there be not present a clerk serving in the mass, or one serving who ought not to serve, as a woman: if there be not a suitable chalice with paten (a chalice), whose bowl ought to be of gold or silver, or tin, not of brass, or of glass: if the corporal be not clean, which ought to be of linen, not of silk adorned in the centre, and must be blessed by a bishop, or other having this power, as has been aforesaid: if he celebrate with head covered, without a dispensation: if he have not the Missal before him, even though he should know by rote the mass which he intends to celebrate." . . . .

"5. If before consecration a fly, or a spider, or any other thing, have fallen into the chalice, he shall throw the wine into a comely place, put other wine into the chalice, mix a little water therewith, offer it, and proceed with the mass: if after consecration a fly have fallen in, or anything of that sort, and a nausea be occasioned to the priest, he shall draw it out, and wash it with wine, and when the mass is finished, burn it, and the ashes and lotion shall be thrown into the *sacrarium*. But if he have not a nausea, nor fear any danger, he shall drink them (ashes and lotion) with the blood." . . . .

"12. If through negligence any of the blood of Christ have fallen on the ground, or on the boards, let it be licked up with the tongue, and let the spot be sufficiently scraped, and the scrapings burned, and the ashes laid up in the sacrarium. But if it have fallen on the altar-stone, let the priest suck up the drop; and let the place be well washed, and the ablution thrown into the sacrarium. If on the altar-cloth, and the drop has penetrated to the second, and also to the third cloth, let the cloths in the places where the drop has fallen, be washed over the chalice, and the suds thrown into the sacrarium: but if on the corporal only, or on the priest's vestments, it ought to be washed out in like manner, and the ablution thrown into the sacrarium: so also if on the foot-cloth, or on the carpet.

"14. If the priest vomit the Eucharist, if the species appear entire, let them be reverently swallowed, unless sickness arise: for then let the consecrated species be cautiously separated and laid up in some sacred place, till they are corrupted; and afterwards let them be cast into the sacrarium. But if the species do not appear, let the vomit be burned, and the ashes cast into the sacrarium.

"16. *Defects also may occur in the ministration itself, if the priest is ignorant of the rites and ceremonies that are to be observed therein; all which* (rites and ceremonies) *are copiously laid down in the preceding Rubrics."—Rom. Missal.* Mech.

Thus, there are many defects which may occur to invalidate the consecrating act. If consecration do not take place, the people fall down and worship what, according to their own Church, is mere flour and water.

The Proba or Poisoned Host.

So great is the uncertainty which exists in the Church of Rome as to the valid consecration of the Host, that the Pope himself does not venture to receive the wafer until it has been first tasted by an officer appointed for the purpose.

When his Holiness is a communicant, the following ceremonies, as described by the *Roman Catholic Calendar*, are used:—

"The cardinal deacon then places three hosts upon the paten, and the pyx near the chalice. He takes one of the three hosts, touches with it the other two, and gives it to M. *Sagrista;* he then takes another of the hosts, and touches it with the paten, and the chalice inside and outside, and gives it also to the *Sagrista*, who eats the two hosts. He then takes the cruets, and pours from them some wine and water into the cup held by the *Sagrista*, who drinks from it. This ceremony is called the *proba*."—Dublin, *Roman Catholic Calendar*, p. 146.

The following explanation is given by the *Calendar* of these ceremonies:—

'Meursius shows, that at regal banquets it was customary to have persons who tasted the meats, in order to remove the suspicion of poison. By the Romans they were called *prægustatores*, and the chief of them in the emperor's household was named Procurator Prægustatorum. Claudis is said to have been poisoned 'per Halotum spadonem prægustatorem,'—Suetonius in Claud. cap. XLIV. This year an inscription has been found at Cervetri beginning thus: M. Claudius Aug. lib. Prægustator. triclinar. proc. a muneribus proc. aquar. proc. castrensis. As men have sometimes sacrilegiously mixed poison with the bread and wine used at mass, the Cæremoniale Episcoporum prescribes, that when a bishop sings mass, they should be tasted first by the Credentiarii, or butlers, and afterwards by the sacristan. Lambert, an old writer quoted by Fleury, says that a sub-deacon attempted to poison Pope Victor II. at mass. A Dominican friar was falsely accused of having poisoned the emperor Henry VII. at mass. Gonzalez de Castiglio, an Augustinian friar, was poisoned at the altar, by a widow in 1479. Unhappily, even in our own times, this abominable sacrilege has been attempted."—Dublin, *Roman Catholic Calendar*, p. 146.

Now, on this fact, we observe,—

1. That persons have been poisoned by the Host. They were taught to believe, on pain of damnation, that the Host was God. Implicitly acknowledging this dogma, they received the wafer, and were poisoned.

2. Whenever a bishop sings Mass, the *Ceremoniale Episcoporum* prescribes, that the *proba* shall be used; which shows, still further, the great uncertainty of Rome on this point.

3. The Church of Rome has more regard for the bodies of the popes and bishops, than for either the bodies or souls of the people. When life is endangered by the admixture of poison with the bread and wine, a precaution is adopted for the preservation of his Holiness and the bishops; but there is no safeguard against the peril of idolatry; the people may worship the unconsecrated cake, and there is no help!

4. Rome, with all her pretensions to infallibility and certainty, cannot assure her members that the Host, which they worship as God, is not a poisoned cake.

5. One of the leading objects, if not the great object of religion, is the worship of God; but that object is so

perverted by the Church of Rome, that the Host, which she adores as God in her most solemn service—the Mass, may, according to her own admission, be a poisoned wafer.

6. She is guilty of wilful sin in this matter! She is aware of the defects which may occur by want of intention on the part of the priest, and of the due performance of numerous ceremonials; yet she requires her people, in every case, to worship it as God. The priest elevates the Host, and they fall down and adore it as "God over all!"

We would call upon our Roman Catholic fellow-men to weigh the matter—to recollect the numerous defects which may prevent consecration. Even one Baptism, rendered invalid by the want of intention, may nullify ten thousand sacraments, and carry confusion and discord into the Church. The baptised (supposed) may be admitted to the priesthood, and then, every baptism administered by him is invalid,—every consecration, a nullity,—every Mass, a service of the creature. Those whom he baptises may also enter the priesthood, or even the episcopate and highest offices of the Church, and thus the invalidity is communicated from one to another, *and in ten thousand ramifications.* It is morally impossible that the Romanist, according to his own principles, can be certain of possessing a Christian sacrament, or of worshipping a validly consecrated Host!

An infallible Church, even according to her own principles, cannot assure her members that the object of her worship is not a *poisoned cake!*

Questions and Answers.

1. *Q.*—If the priest should not *intend* to do what he professes to do, in consecrating the bread and wine, what is the consequence?

A.—The consecration is invalid, and, therefore, the bread and wine remain in their natural substances, and do not undergo any change.

2. *Q.*—Is the bread, or Host, worshipped notwithstanding?

A.—Yes; for the people, not possessing the attribute of omniscience, cannot know the thoughts and *intents* of the priests.

3. *Q.*—What, therefore, is the consequence?

A.—The people worship a mere creature,—that which their own Church acknowledges to be a creature.

4. *Q.*—Are there any other defects which may arise and invalidate the consecration?

A.—Yes, many; which are enumerated in the *Roman Missal.*

5. *Q.*—Into what general heads are the defects divided?

A.—Into three:—1. Defects may occur on the part of the matter to be consecrated; 2. On that of the form to be used; 3. And on the part of the minister.

6. *Q.*—Mention some of the defects on the part of the matter.

A.—If the bread be not wheat; or, if wheaten, if it be mixed with any other grain in such quantity that it no longer remains wheaten bread; or if the wine be quite sour, or be pressed from unripe grapes, or be corrupted, the sacrament is null.

7. *Q.*—Mention defects of form.

A.—If certain words be not used, the sacrament is null.

8. *Q.*—What defects may arise on the part of the minister?

A.—He must have intention, disposition of soul, disposition of body, disposition of vestment, and disposition in the ministration itself. These various things required, are detailed in the *Missal.*

9. *Q.*—How does the great uncertainty, which must exist as to the valid consecration of the Host, more particularly appear?

A.—From the fact that the Pope himself does not venture to receive the Host in the Pontifical Mass, until it has been tasted by an officer appointed for the purpose.

10. *Q.*—What is the reason of this?

A.—Lest his Holiness should be poisoned.

11. *Q.*—Was any one ever poisoned by the consecrated Host?

A.—Yes; Gonzalez de Castiglio in 1479.

12. *Q.*—What is the natural inference from this fact?

A.—That the Church of Rome, with all her pretended infallibility, cannot assure her members, that the Host which they worship is not *a poisoned cake.*

CHAPTER XII.

Transubstantiation Opposed to Scripture and the Senses.

(PART THIRD.)

FIFTH ARTICLE OF THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV.

"I profess likewise, that in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead. And that in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist, there are truly, really, and substantially the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood: which conversion the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation. I also confess, that under either kind alone, Christ is received whole and entire, and a true sacrament."—*Extracted from the* "Ordo Administrandi Sacramenti," p. 67. London, 1840.

HAVING answered the arguments which are urged in favour of transubstantiation, we shall now prove, that the dogma in question, is opposed both to the Word of God and the testimony of the senses.

I. Christ bodily absent.—The Bible teaches that Christ is *bodily* absent from us. The Church of Rome avers, that He is literally present on every altar. Christ is ever present with His people in the Spirit, and with them even unto the end of the world, but not in the *flesh.* Jesus alludes to His departure, when He says,—

John 14. 1. Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in me. V 2. In my Father's house are many man

sions: if it were not so, I would have told you. *I go to prepare a place for you.* V 28. Ye have heard how I said unto you, *I go away*, and come again unto you. If ye love me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I *go* unto the Father.

Peter says,—

Acts 3. 20. And he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you. V 21. Whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things.

Every text which proves that Christ ascended into heaven, disproves the dogma of transubstantiation.

Thus Christ's body having ascended into heaven, must there remain until the restitution of all things; when He shall come forth, in "power and great glory," to make His enemies lick the dust.

II. The Law forbids the Use of Blood.—The doctrine of transubstantiation involves a breach of the law of God. By the law of Moses the people were forbidden to partake of blood, Levit. xvii. 14. This law was ratified under the gospel dispensation, Acts xv. 28, 29. It is impossible to suppose that while the Apostles thus ratified the law of God, they believed and taught that they were partakers, not merely of the blood of an animal, but of a man!

III. Christ will come Bodily at His Second Advent.—The doctrine which teaches that Christ is come upon every altar, is opposed to the Scripture truth, that when He comes again, it will be in the clouds of heaven, and as the lightning that cometh out of the east and shineth unto the west,—

Matt. 24. 30. And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory.

Acts 1. 11. Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven.

He ascended into heaven accompanied by angels in glory, and so it shall be when He comes again,—

Rev. 1. 7. Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him: and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him. Even so, Amen.

If Christ were already present in His body, blood, soul, and Deity, upon every altar, we should believe that He has already come, and we could not so consistently look forward to His second advent. The warning of the Saviour, in connection with the subject of the advent, is most remarkable. He says,—

Matt. 24. 23. Then if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there; believe it not. V 24. For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect. V 25. Behold, I have told you before. V 26. Wherefore if they shall say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert; go not forth: behold, he is in *the secret chambers*; believe it not. V 27. For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be.

The word ταμειοις, translated secret chambers, is rendered in the Romish Douay version "closets," and it means *tabernacles*. The Romish priests say, "Lo, here "is Christ, and there," on this altar and that altar,—literally, in the *tabernacles*;* but Christ says, "Believe "it not," for when the Son of man comes from heaven, it will be as the lightning that cometh out of the east and shineth unto the west.

IV. Christ not subject to Humiliation.—The doctrine of transubstantiation, according to which Christ is now humiliated, is opposed to the Scripture truth, that His humiliation has terminated, and that He is now, as the reward of His sufferings, exalted in heaven.

The following prayer is found in the *Missal* for the laity:—

"May thy body, O Lord, which I have received, and thy blood which I have drank, *cleave to my bowels*, and grant that no stain of sin may remain in me, who have been fed with this pure and holy sacrament. Who lived and reigned for ever and ever. Amen."—*The Pocket Missal for the use of the Laity*, p. 30. Dublin, 1844.

The *Roman Missal*, published in Mechlin, 1840, contains the following rubric:—

"If the priest vomit the Eucharist, if the species appear entire, let them be reverently swallowed, unless sickness arise; for then let

* It is remarkable that the Host is placed in what is called "*the tabernacle*."

the consecrated species be cautiously separated and laid up in some sacred place until they are corrupted, and afterwards let them be cast into the sacrarium. But if the species do not appear, let the vomit be burned and the ashes cast into the sacrarium."

Thus, according to Roman doctrine, the body of our Lord cleaves to the bowels of the communicant. It may wallow in the vomit of the priest—debasing dogma! If this be true, Christ is still humiliated, yea, the blessed Jesus, with reverence we speak, is subject to the lowest degradation. *But this is not the doctrine of the Bible.* He now wears the crown; He is now at the right hand of the Father; He is exalted with great triumph in the skies; His humiliation, His life of ignominy, woe, and suffering, has ended,—

Philip. 2. 8. And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. V 9. *Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him,* and given him a name which is above every name; V 10 That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth.

Heb. 2. 9. But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man.

Acts 2. 33. Therefore being by the right hand of God *exalted.*

Acts 2. 36. Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both *Lord and Christ.*

V. Christ's Body not Corruptible.—Transubstantiation, according to which Christ's body is subject to corruption, contradicts the Word of God. The preceding quotation from the *Roman Missal* contains the following passage:—"Let them, the consecrated elements, "be cast into the Sacrarium, UNTIL THEY ARE CORRUPTED." In Psalm xvi. 10, it is written, "For thou "wilt not leave my soul in hell; *neither wilt thou suffer "thine Holy One to see corruption.*"

This declaration is applied, by the Apostle Peter, to the body of Christ,—

Acts 2. 25. For David speaketh concerning him, I foresaw the Lord always before my face; for he is on my right hand, that I should not be moved: V 26. Therefore did my heart rejoice, and my tongue was glad; moreover also, my flesh shall rest in hope; V 27. Because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.

Thus the Bible and the Missal are at direct variance.

VI. The Host the Work of Hands.—The Host is made of flour and water, and baked upon the fire. The Church of Rome teaches, that when the priest pronounces the words, "*Hoc est corpus meum,*" it is converted into the body of Christ. Transubstantiation is opposed to the Word of God, which testifies that the work of men's hands is not God. When the Psalmist would refute the heathen doctrine in reference to the Godhead, he says,—

Psalm 135. 15. The idols of the heathen are silver and gold, *the work* of men's hands. V 16. They have mouths, but they speak not; eyes have they, but they see not; V 17. They have ears, but they hear not; neither is there any breath in their mouths. V 18. They that make them are like unto them: so is every one that trusteth in them.

How remarkable is the reasoning of the prophet Isaiah against the gods of the heathen! In chapters xl., xliv., and xlvi., especially, he contrasts the omnipotence and glory of Jehovah with the idols of the heathen. The same contrast is applicable in reference to the wafer. In chap. xliv. he says,—

Isa. 44. 16. He burneth part thereof in the fire; with part thereof he eateth flesh; he roasteth roast, and is satisfied: yea, he warmeth himself, and saith, Aha, I am warm, I have seen the fire: V 17. And the residue thereof he maketh a god, even his graven image: he falleth down unto it, and worshippeth it, and prayeth unto it, and saith, Deliver me; for thou art my god. V 18. They have not known nor understood: for he hath shut their eyes, that they cannot see; and their hearts, that they cannot understand. V 19. And none considereth in his heart, neither is there knowledge nor understanding to say, I have burned part of it in the fire; yea, also I have baked bread upon the coals thereof; I have roasted flesh, and eaten it: and shall I make the residue thereof an abomination? shall I fall down to the stock of a tree? V 20. He feedeth on ashes: a deceived heart hath turned him aside, that he cannot deliver his soul, nor say Is there not a lie in my right hand?

He argues, that the very fact of its having been made, was sufficient to prove that it was not God. The same argument applies, with equal force, to the wafer made and baked. The Apostle, likewise, preached, "They "be no gods which are made with hands," Acts xix. 26.

How could he have thus preached, if he believed that the wafer was God?

VII. Transubstantiation destroys the Nature of a Sacrament.—Transubstantiation destroys the nature of a sacrament, and sets aside the great object of our Lord's institution. We have already seen, that this ordinance was instituted "in remembrance of" Christ, and that therein we "do show the Lord's death till *he* "come," 1 Cor. xi. 26. If the Host be Christ himself, it is not a remembrance of Him; nor is it a sacrament, or *sign*, or *remembrance*, of the thing signified, if it be the very thing itself.

The Apostle says,—

2 Cor. 5. 16. Wherefore, henceforth know we no man after the flesh; yea, though we have known Christ after *the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more.*

VIII. The Senses and Transubstantiation.—It subverts the evidence upon which all human belief, and Christianity itself, rest. All our knowledge is *ultimately* derived through the senses, which are five,—sight, hearing, smelling, tasting, and feeling. Were it not for the senses, the Apostles, and we ourselves, could know nothing of Christ. They saw and heard Him. They appeal to the senses as the highest evidence.

St John says,—

1 John 1. 1. That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, of the Word of life; V 2. For the life was manifested, and we have seen it, and bear witness, and show unto you that eternal life which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us; V 3. That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us: and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ.

In Acts i. 3, the senses are referred to as infallible evidence,—

Acts 1. 3. To whom also he showed himself alive after his passion by many *infallible* proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God.

Deprive man of his senses, and he can know nothing.*

* Many of the mysteries of the Christian religion,—as, for instance, the doctrine of the Trinity,—are incapable of proof by the

All human knowledge, religious and secular, is based thereon. The Apostles, on the evidence of two senses, believed in Christ. On the evidence of all our senses, we disbelieve Transubstantiation. The eyes see, the ears hear (if the wafer fall on the ground), the nose smells, the hand feels, the palate tastes, that the wafer is not a human body; and if the evidence of two senses be infallible, when bearing testimony to Christianity, *a fortiori*, the evidence of all the senses is infallible when bearing testimony against Transubstantiation. We have, in reality, infallible evidence for believing Rome teaches falsehood.

Questions and Answers.

1. *Q.*—Is Christ *bodily* present with His people?

A.—No. His body is in heaven.—John xiv. 1-3; John xiv. 28; Acts iii. 20, 21.

2. *Q.*—How does this disprove the dogma of Transubstantiation?

A.—Because, according to that dogma, He is bodily present on every altar.

3. *Q.*—How is the law of God opposed to the notion of Transubstantiation?

A.—It forbids the use of blood; and this law was ratified by the Apostles.—Acts xv. 28.

4. *Q.*—When Christ comes bodily from heaven, how shall that coming be revealed?

---

senses, and yet they are received as Divine verities. It is asked, Why may not transubstantiation be received? We answer distinctly, that the doctrine of the Trinity and such mysteries are *beyond* the reach of the senses, but transubstantiation is *opposed to* the senses. This makes a vast difference. There are truths of which the senses can take *no* cognizance; but there are no truths which are *opposed to* the senses.

The doctrine of the Trinity comes not within the province of the senses, and is therefore not opposed to their testimony. Transubstantiation comes within the province of the senses, and is utterly opposed to their testimony. We are, however, indebted for our *knowledge* of the doctrine of the Trinity to the senses. We believe in the Trinity, and in the immortality of the soul, on the authority of the Bible; but if we had neither *sight* nor *hearing*, we could know nothing of the Bible. The Romish denial of the testimony of the senses would lead to consequences most absurd.

A.—In power and glory.—Mat. xxiv. 30; Acts i. 11.

5. *Q.*—How does this last fact disprove the carnal presence of Christ upon the altar?

A.—Because the supposed coming of Christ upon the altar, when the priest consecrates, is unaccompanied by any such manifestation.

6. *Q.*—What command did Christ give as to the false Christs and false prophets who should arise?

A.—To believe them not when they said, "Lo, here "is Christ, or there." "Behold, he is in the secret chamber."

7. *Q.*—How does this refer to the priests of the Church of Rome?

A.—They say that Christ is here and there; on this and that altar; in "the secret chambers."

8. *Q.*—What is meant by the secret chambers?

A.—The word rendered "secret chambers" in the Protestant version, is translated "closets" in the Douay. It means, and might be translated "tabernacles." There is a tabernacle on every Romish altar, and the priests say, "Behold, he is in the tabernacles;" for the host is in the tabernacle.

9. *Q.*—If Transubstantiation be true, Christ is still humiliated. Is this opposed to Scripture?

A.—Yes; for Christ's season of humiliation terminated, and He is now exalted.—Acts ii. 33 and 36; Philip. ii. 8, 9.

10. *Q.*—The *Roman Missal* states, that the Host may corrupt. Can the body of Christ corrupt?

A.—No; for we are distinctly told, that God will not suffer His Holy One to see corruption.

11. *Q.*—What principle urged by prophets and apostles against the gods of the heathen, may be urged with equal power against the worship of the Host as God?

A.—That whatever is made with hands, cannot be God.—Psalm cxxxv. 15–18; Isa. xliv.; Acts xix. 26.

12. *Q.*—What are the senses?

A.—Sight, hearing, smelling, tasting, and feeling.

13. *Q.*—Are the senses opposed to Transubstantiation?

A.—Yes. Their conjoint, as well as separate, testimony declare, that the wafer is not a human body.

14. *Q.*—Should we receive the testimony of the senses?

A.—Yes. Without the senses, we can know nothing. The miracles of Christ were an appeal to their testimony. In short, were it not for *sight* and *hearing*, the Apostles could not have seen or heard our Lord.

CHAPTER XIII.

The Mass not supported by Scripture.

(PART FIRST.)

FIFTH ARTICLE OF THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV.

"I profess likewise, that in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead. And that in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist, there are truly, really, and substantially the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood: which conversion the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation. I also confess, that under either kind alone, Christ is received whole and entire, and a true sacrament."—*Extracted from the* "Ordo Administrandi Sacramenti," p. 67. London, 1840.

THE doctrine of the Mass is founded upon that of Transubstantiation. The Council of Trent says,—

"And since in this divine sacrifice, which is performed in the Mass, the same Christ is contained, and is bloodlessly immolated, who once offered himself bloodily upon the cross; the holy council teaches that this sacrifice is truly propitiatory, and that by its means, if we approach God, contrite and penitent, with a true heart, and a right faith, and with fear and reverence, we may obtain mercy, and obtain grace in seasonable succour. For the Lord, *appeased by the oblation of this sacrifice*, granting grace and the gift of repentance, *remits even great crimes and sins.* There is one and the same victim, and the same person, who now offers by the ministry of the priests, who then offered himself upon the cross; the mode of offering only being different. And the fruits of that bloody offering are truly most abundantly received through this offering, so far is it from derogating in any way from the former. Wherefore it is properly offered according to the apostolical tradition, not only for the sins, pains, satisfactions, and other wants of the faithful, who are alive, but also *for the dead in Christ, who are not yet fully purged.*"—*Canons of Trent*, c. 2. Sess. 22.

This canon teaches, 1. That the same Christ is contained in the Mass who was offered on the cross; 2. That the Mass is an unbloody offering; 3. Truly propitiatory; 4. And offered for the dead who are not fully purged, as well as for the living. In this chapter we shall consider the arguments which are advanced in favour of the Mass.

Bossuet, in his exposition, having argued at length upon the transubstantiation and adoration of the elements, says,—

"These things being supposed, there remains no particular difficulty about the Sacrifice which we acknowledge in the Eucharist."—*Expost.*, p. 54. Dublin, 1831.

Thus the leading argument in its favour is Transubstantiation. We have already shown that this dogma is not only unsupported by the Word of God, but opposed to its clear testimony, and fraught with consequences the most absurd and irrational. Every argument against Transubstantiation applies equally to the Mass. The superstructure of the Mass, being raised upon the false foundation of Transubstantiation, falls to the ground.

Scripture Texts Considered.

Certain texts are quoted in its support. We take them in the order in which they occur in *The Grounds of Catholic Doctrine*:—

"*Q.*—What scripture do you bring for this?

"*A.*—The words of consecration as they are related by St Luke, chap. xxii. v. 19, 20. '*This is my body, which is given for you. This is the chalice, the New Testament in my blood, which shall be shed for you.*' *If the cup be shed for us*, that is, for our sins, it must needs be a propitiatory, at least by applying to us the fruits of the bloody sacrifice of the cross."—P. 32. Dub., 1838.

We answer, that the passage is mistranslated in the Douay version. Christ did not say, "*shall* be shed," but, "*is* shed" for you. Now, in reference to this text and its translation, Romish advocates are in a dilemma or puzzle. Mr Browne, Roman Catholic priest, in the Downside Discussion, adopted the Protestant translation "*is* shed," in order to show that, at the last Supper, there was a victim and sacrifice. His words are,—

"But in the text I just now quoted from St Luke, there is an express mention made of an oblation and *effusion* of blood."—P. 410, *Downside Discussion.*

The *Vulgate*, however, the only authorised version of Trent, the Douay Bible, and the canon of the Mass, all use the future tense, "*effundetur*," or *shall* be shed.

In any case the Church of Rome is in a dilemma. Either the present tense, "is shed," as employed in the Protestant version (the strict translation of the Greek original, and adopted by certain Romanists), or the future tense, "shall be shed," is correct. If the former, the use of the present tense proves that the words of Christ are figurative; for *in point of fact* his blood was not then shed. If the latter, the future tense proves that there was no effusion of blood at the last Supper; and, therefore, no victim or sacrifice.

The Grounds of Catholic Doctrine proceeds,—

"*Q.*—What other text of the scripture do the Fathers apply to the sacrifice of the Mass?

"*A.*—The words of God in the first chapter of the prophet Malachi, v. 10, 11, where, rejecting the Jewish sacrifices, he declares his acceptance of that sacrifice or pure offering which should be made to him in every place among the Gentiles. 2dly, Those words of the Psalmist, Ps. cix. v. 4, '*Thou art a priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedech.*' Why according to the order of Melchisedech? say the holy fathers, but by reason of the sacrifice of the Eucharist, prefigured by that bread and wine offered by Melchisedech, Gen. xiv. v. 18."—P. 33. Dub., 1838.

Here are two arguments,—one in reference to the offering referred to by Malachi, and the other in reference to Melchisedec.

I. They refer to Malachi,—

Malachi 1. 11. For from the rising of the sun, even unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering: for my name shall be great among the heathen, saith the Lord of hosts.

Prayer, praise, obedience, a broken and contrite heart, are represented as incense and oblation, or sacrifice.

The Psalmist says,—

Psalm 141. 2. Let my prayer be set forth before thee as incense, and the lifting up of my hands as the evening sacrifice.

Psalm 51. 17. The sacrifices of God are a *broken spirit:* a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise.

Hebrews 13. 16. To do good and to communicate forget not: for with *such sacrifices* God is well pleased.

Romans 12. 1. I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service.

Such sacrifices are "*holy, acceptable* unto God," though imperfect in themselves; they are pure as presented by our High Priest, Christ; for "we are complete in him."

Colos. 2. 9. For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. V. 10. And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power.

Romanists argue, that the original word *mincha,* means always a literal sacrifice. Such, however, is not the case, for it is written,—

Isaiah 66. 19. And they shall declare my glory among the Gentiles. V 20. And they shall bring all your brethren for an *offering* unto the Lord.

Fathers on Sacrifice.—Reference is made to the teaching of the Fathers. They were, no doubt, unsound in their views to a great extent; but still, upon many points, they are thoroughly opposed to Romanism. We quote some of their statements in reference to the Christian sacrifice. Chrysostom says,—

"And through him we offer a sacrifice to God. What sacrifice does he mean? He himself has explained, saying, the fruit of the lips, which confess his name, that is, *prayers, hymns, thanksgiving.* For these are the fruit of the lips. They offered sheep and calves, and gave to the priest, but we offer none of these things, *but thanksgiving, and the imitation of Christ in all things as far as is possible.* May our lips thus blossom forth. 'Be not forgetful of well-doing and liberality, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased.' Let us give, he says, to him such a sacrifice, that he may offer it to the Father."—Hom. xxxiii. *Expost. ad Hebr.*

Again,—

"Nor does he require anything hard and grievous from us, but only to acknowledge such goodness, and to present to him thanksgiving for it. Not because he has need of it, for he wants nothing, but that we may be taught to draw near to him who supplies good things, and may not be forgetful, but may present virtue worthy of the benefits, and of such protection. For thus we provoke him to greater solicitude over us. I exhort you, therefore, let us not be remiss, but let each of you, every hour, as far as he can do so, reckon up within himself not only the common benefits, but those also which have happened to himself, and not those confessed and mani-

fest to all, but the multitude of those, also, which are private and hidden. For he will thus be able to offer continual thanksgiving to the Lord. *This is the greatest sacrifice;* this is the perfect offering."—In c. i. Genesis.

Again,—

"But who taketh away the sins of the world, as if he were always doing it. For he did not then only take them when he suffered, but from that time till the present time he takes away sins. He is not always crucified, for he offered *one* sacrifice for sins; but he always purifies by that one (sacrifice)."—In c. i. John, Hom. xvii.

Again,—

"Giving the Spirit, by whom he did both of these, at once making prophets, and priests, and kings. For the old system anointed those (selected) races. But we possess not one only, but the three prerogatives pre-eminently. For we are about to enjoy a kingdom, and we are priests offering our bodies as a sacrifice, (for 'present your bodies,' he says, 'a living sacrifice, well-pleasing to God'); and together with these, we are appointed to be prophets, for 'those things which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, have been revealed unto us.'"—Hom. iii., in 2 Cor.

Again,—

"What means, sacrifice the sacrifice of righteousness? *Seek righteousness, offer righteousness. This is the greatest gift to God;* this is the acceptable sacrifice; this is the offering which is well-pleasing (viz.), not to sacrifice a sheep and calves, but to work righteousness . . . . . *this sacrifice needs not money*, nor a sword, nor an altar, nor fire. It is not dissolved into smoke, and ashes, and savour, but it is satisfied with the disposition of him who brings it. To this neither is poverty an obstacle, nor is destitution an impediment, nor place, nor any other such thing. But wherever you are, you may offer it, *you yourself being both the priest, and the altar, and the knife, and the victim.*"—In Psalm iv.

Here the original for offering is *mincha*, evidently not meaning a literal sacrifice.

II. They refer to Genesis xiv. 18,—

Genesis 14. 18. And Melchisedec king of Salem brought forth bread and wine: and he was the priest of the Most High God.

The words translated "*and* he was the priest," &c., they render, "*for* he was the priest," &c., in order to show that he brought forth bread and wine in his official capacity.

1. Their version is a mistranslation. The Hebrew word which they translate "*for*," they themselves render "*and*" in the context.

2. He brought forth bread and wine to *refresh* Abra-

ham and his men. Josephus the Jew corroborates this:—

"So Abram, when he had saved the captive Sodomites, who had been taken by the Assyrians, and Lot also, his kinsman, returned home in peace. Now the king of Sodom met him at a certain place, which they called, The King's Dale, where Melchisedec, king of the city Salem, received him. That name signifies, *The righteous king;* and such he was without dispute, insomuch that, on this account, he was made the priest of God: however, they afterwards called Salem, *Jerusalem. Now this Melchisedec supplied Abram's army in an hospitable manner, and gave them provisions in abundance; and as they were feasting, he began to praise him, and to bless God for subduing his enemies under him.* And when Abram gave him the tenth part of his prey, he accepted of the gift; but the King of Sodom desired Abram to take the prey, but entreated that he might have those men restored to him whom Abram had saved from the Assyrians, because they belonged to him: but Abram would not do so; nor would make any other advantage of that prey than what his servants had eaten; but still insisted that he should afford a part to his friends that had assisted him in the battle. The first of them was called Eshcol, and then Aner, and Mamre."—*Josephus*, p. 40. London, 1849.

3. It is evident that he offered no sacrifice, for the Apostle, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, describing the character and conduct of Melchisedec, says nothing of sacrifice. Is it possible that the Apostle could have been silent upon this leading point, if Melchisedec had offered bread and wine in type of the Eucharist?

4. If Melchisedec did offer bread and wine, which we wholly deny, he did so in type of Christ's offering on the cross; for Melchisedec was a type of Jesus.

Such are the arguments in favour of the great service of Rome—the Mass.

Questions and Answers.

1. *Q.*—Upon what is the doctrine of the Mass founded?

A.—Upon the dogma of Transubstantiation.

2. *Q.*—What does the Council of Trent teach as to the Mass?

A.—1. That the same Christ is offered in the Mass, who was offered on the cross; 2. That the Mass is an unbloody offering; 3. That it is truly *propitiatory;*

4. And offered for souls in purgatory, as well as for the living.

3. *Q.*—How do Roman Catholics labour to prove that at the last Supper there was a victim and sacrifice?

A.—They quote the words, "This cup is the New "Testament in my blood, which *is* shed for you."

4. *Q.*—What difference is there between the Protestant and the Romish version of this passage?

A.—The Protestant version renders it, as above, "*is* "*shed.*" The Romish employs the future tense, "*shall* "*be shed.*"

5. *Q.*—How does the inconsistency of Romish advocates appear in reference to this?

A.—When endeavouring to prove that there was a victim at the last Supper, they take the Protestant translation, "*is shed;*" though the *Vulgate*, the Douay Bible, and the Canon of the Mass, use the future tense, *effundetur*, "*shall* be shed."

6. *Q.*—In what dilemma are they placed?

A.—Either their translation is right or wrong. If right, Christ's blood was not shed at the last Supper; for He uses the future tense, "*shall be shed.*" If wrong, the Vulgate, the Canon of the Mass, and the Douay version, are wrong.

7. *Q.*—What is the meaning of the Protestant translation, "is shed?" Was Christ's blood shed at the last Supper before He died on the cross?

A.—No. In point of fact it was not shed then; and the Saviour's words, being in the present tense, prove that He spoke figuratively and not literally.

8. *Q.*—What passage is quoted from Malachi in proof of the Mass?

A.—"For from the rising of the sun, even unto the "going down of the same, my name shall be great "among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall "be offered unto my name, and a pure offering: for my "name shall be great among the heathen, saith the "Lord of hosts," Malachi i. 11.

9. *Q.*—What is the offering spoken of here?

A.—The spiritual sacrifice of prayer, and praise, and Christian devotion.—Psalm li. 17; Heb. xiii. 16; Rom. xii. 1.

10. *Q.*—Can the Christian's offering be called "pure?"

A.—Yes, in Christ. "For we are unto God a sweet "savour of Christ," 2 Cor. ii. 15.

11. *Q.*—Romanists argue that the word *mincha* means necessarily a literal sacrifice; how do you disprove this?

A.—By Isaiah lxvi. 19, 20.

12. *Q.*—How do you reply to their argument, derived from the *Romish* version of Genesis xiv. 18, when Melchisedec is represented as bringing forth bread and wine, *for* he was priest of the Most High God?

A.—1. It is a mistranslation. The word translated "*for*," is rendered, in the context (Douay version), "*and*." 2. He brought forth bread and wine to refresh Abraham and his followers, not to sacrifice. 3. The Apostle, speaking of Melchisedec, Heb. vii., says nothing of sacrifice. 4. Even if the bread and wine were typical of a sacrifice, *which we deny*, they were typical of the sacrifice of Christ, of whom Melchisedec was a type.

CHAPTER XIV.

The Mass contrary to Scripture.

(PART SECOND.)

FIFTH ARTICLE OF THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV.

"I profess likewise, that in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead. And that in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist, there are truly, really, and substantially the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood; which conversion the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation. I also confess, that under either kind alone, Christ is received whole and entire, and a true sacrament."—*Extracted from the* "Ordo Administrandi Sacramenti," p. 67. London, 1840.

If there be no Transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, it is admitted

that there can be no sacrifice of the Mass. But we have already proved, that there is no Transubstantiation of the bread and wine; therefore there is no sacrifice in the Mass. It is no sacrifice, but an offering of mere flour and water.

Scripture argument on this subject may be divided into that which is negative and positive.*

Negative Scripture Argument against the Mass.

The very absence of Scripture testimony for the Mass, is evidence against it. The priests of the Church of Rome lay claim to a high office and great powers; but the higher their profession, the clearer should be their credentials.

If they are appointed to offer *propitiatory* sacrifice to God, of elements consecrated by them, and converted into the literal body of Christ, we ask them to show their authority. The very want of such authority, would be valid ground upon which to reject their claims, had we even no positive arguments against their assumptions.

1. We appeal to the commission given by Christ to His Apostles; 2. To the directions which are given by the Apostles to the first ministers of the Gospel; and 3. To the account which is recorded of the assemblies of Christians for worship; and we find no trace of a sacrificial priesthood, or of literal sacrifice.

I. The Apostles not Sacrificers.—Christ said to His Apostles,—

Matt. 28. 19. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; V 20. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen.

Here there is not one word about sacrifice.

We know that the sacerdotal or sacrificial character is the great characteristic of the Roman priesthood. In the ordination service, they are addressed as follows:—

* This was Mr Tottenham's order of argument in the *Downside Discussion.*

"Receive thou power *to offer sacrifice* to God, and to celebrate masses, both for the living and for the dead. In the name of the Lord. Amen."—*Roman Pontifical, first part.*

It cannot for one moment be supposed, that Christ recognised any such characteristic in the Apostles, and yet observed silence upon that leading point. He commanded them *to preach the Gospel*, but not to sacrifice.

Indeed, the office of a sacrificing priesthood can have no existence under the Gospel dispensation. This is evident from the argument of the Apostle in the 7th chapter of his Epistle to the Hebrews. Contrasting the priesthood of the Jews with that of Christ, he gives three reasons for the cessation of the former, on the appearance in the flesh of the Son of God, who is "the "Apostle and high priest of our profession," Heb. iii. 1. These reasons apply with equal force against the Romish priesthood.

1. Heb. 7. 23. *They* truly were *many* priests (in succession), because they were not suffered to continue by reason of death; V 24. But *this* man, because he *continueth for ever* hath an unchangeable (or an untransferable) priesthood.

2. Heb. 7. 27. Who needeth not *daily*, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's: for this he did *once*, when he offered up himself.

3. Heb. 7. 28. For the law maketh men high priests *which have infirmity;* but the word of the oath, which was since the law, maketh the Son, who is consecrated for evermore.

"The weakness and unprofitableness" of the Jewish priesthood, were apparent from the fact,—

1. That they were many; 2. Because they needed to offer up sacrifices for their own sins; 3. That they were men of infirmity. So the Romish priests are, (1.) Many; (2.) Their sacrifices are oft repeated; and (3.) They are men of infirmity: but Christ offered *one* sacrifice, and is consecrated for evermore,—"*holy, harmless, undefiled,* "*separate* from sinners, and made higher than the "heavens." There is therefore no priest,* in the sacrificial sense, under the Christian dispensation but Christ, "the Apostle and high priest of our profession;" and it

* In a spiritual sense, every believer is a priest.—"Ye are a chosen generation a royal priesthood," 1 Peter ii. 9.

is remarkable, that the Greek word ἱερεύς, meaning "sacrificing priest," is nowhere applied to ministers of the Gospel. The Romish priesthood have no commission from Christ to *sacrifice.*

II. Apostles did not commission others to offer Literal Sacrifice. — The Apostles, in founding the Church, give many directions to ministers of the Word.

St Paul especially, in his Epistles to Timothy and Titus, refers to the duties of the ministry. They are exhorted to give themselves to "reading, to exhortation, "to doctrine," 1 Tim. iv. 13; how to conduct themselves in the house of God, 1 Tim. iii. 15; how to regulate their families, 1 Tim. iii.; to "preach the word; be "instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, "exhort, with all long-suffering and doctrine," 2 Tim. iv. 2. Many particulars are specified; *but nowhere do we find even the most distant hint to sacrifice!* The great business of the Romish priest is to offer, in the Mass, the body, blood, soul, and deity of our Lord, which is accounted a service of most mysterious and awful import. Strange, that if this were likewise the business of Timothy, Titus, and the primitive ministers of the Gospel, no reference should be made to it in the Epistles, written avowedly for the purpose of instructing them at large on all-important truth.

III. Literal Sacrifice not a part of Primitive Worship. - We turn to the Acts of the Apostles. We read of churches founded, sinners converted, miracles performed in the name of Jesus; of the assembling of Christians together, when the Word was preached and prayer offered; of controversies with the votaries of error; of ceremonial binding and loosing, as in Acts xv.; but nowhere do we find the most distant allusion to the sacrifice of the Ma- .

The Mass is the leading characteristic of Roman worship. Surely Romanism is not the system which the Apostles preached, for we nowhere read in their inspired record of such a service. Contrast any Romish history of Roman Missionaries with "the Acts of the Apostles;"

and as in the former you will meet constant reference to the Mass, but in the latter no such reference, you must feel convinced, that Papal missionaries and the Apostles did not preach the same system. Reader! just think of Paul and Barnabas, or Peter and Silas, offering High Mass at Jerusalem or Antioch!

The Romish priests are, therefore, without authority from Scripture; but we go farther, and say, that the Word of God distinctly disproves the existence of a literal sacrifice.

Positive Scripture Argument against the Mass.

The Scriptures declare, that there is but one sacrifice,—

Heb. 7. 27. Who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's; for this he did *once*, when he offered up himself.

Romanists assert, that the sacrifice of the Mass was instituted at, and commenced in, the Lord's Supper, and that, whenever that Sacrament was observed, Christ was offered a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead.

If this were true, Christ must have been offered thousands of times between the institution of the sacrament and the publication of the Epistle to the Hebrews. But the notion is at once dissipated by the following statements of the Apostle;—

Heb. 7. 27. This he did *once*, when he offered up himself.

The Apostle reiterates this great truth, as if to warn us, prophetically, against the Romish dogma of the Mass. He says,—

Heb. 9. 25. Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with blood of others; V 26. (For then must he *often* have suffered since the foundation of the world:) but now *once* in the end of the world hath he appeared, to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. V 27. And as it is appointed unto men *once* to die, but after this the judgment; V 28. So Christ was *once* offered to bear the sins of many: and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time, without sin, unto salvation.

Here it is said, that as man *once* dies, so Christ was

"*once offered.*" Such language is irreconcileable with the notion of Christ's continued sacrifice in the Mass.

The Apostle continues the subject, and contrasts the continued sacrifices of the Jewish Priesthood with the one sacrifice of Christ:—

Heb. x. 1. For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices, which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect: V 2. For then would they not have ceased to be offered? because that the worshippers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins. V 3. But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year. V 4. For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins. V 5. Wherefore, when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me: V 6. In burnt-offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure: V 7. Then said I, Lo, I come (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God. V 8. Above, when he said, Sacrifice, and offering, and burnt-offerings, and offering for sin, thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein (which are offered by the law); V 9. Then said he, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. V 10. By the which will we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ *once for all.* V 11. And every priest standeth daily ministering, and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins: V 12. But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God; V 13. From henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool.

Upon this passage we make the following observations:—

I. The very repetition of the Jewish sacrifices evidenced their insufficiency. The Romish sacrifices are constantly repeated.

II. The Apostle contrasts Christ with the Jewish priests. "They were daily ministering and offering." Christ "offered one sacrifice for sins," and "for ever "sat down on the right hand of God." How could such a *contrast* exist, if Christ, in the person of the Romish priesthood, were "daily ministering and offering?"

III. He distinctly says, again and again, that Christ was *once* offered. If the Mass had been true, Christ had then been offered thousands of times.

The Church of Rome holds, that Christ is unbloodily

offered in the Mass. If so, there can be no remission of sin connected with that sacrifice.

Heb. 9. 22. Without shedding of blood is no remission.*

* The Rev. George Hamilton points out the difference between the Lord's Supper and the Mass, in the following sixteen particulars:—

St Matthew's account of the institution of the Sacrament, chap. xxvi. 26–29, *taken from the Rhemish Testament.*—"And whilst they were at supper, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake, and gave it to his disciples, and said, Take, eat, this is my body; and taking the chalice he gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all of this; for this is my blood, of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many, for the remission of sins; and I say unto you, I will not drink from henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I shall drink it new with you in the kingdom of my Father."

St Mark's account, chap. xiv. 23–25.—"And whilst they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessing, broke and gave to them, and said, Take ye, this is my body; and having taken the chalice, giving thanks, he gave it to them, and they all drank of it; and he said to them, This is my blood of the New Testament which shall be shed for many. Amen. I say unto you, that I will drink no more of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I shall drink it new in the kingdom of God."

St Luke's account, chap. xxii. 19, 20.—"And taking bread he gave thanks, and brake, and gave to them, saying, This is my body which is given for you; do this for a commemoration of me. In like manner the chalice also, after he had supped, saying, This chalice is the New Testament in my blood which shall be shed for you."

St Paul's account, 1 *Corinthians, chap.* xi. 23–25.—"The Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread, and giving thanks, broke and said, This is my body, which shall be delivered for you; do this for the commemoration of me. In like manner also the chalice after he had supped, saying, This chalice is the New Testament in my blood; this do ye, as oft as ye shall drink it for the commemoration of me."

This is the whole of the account given in the New Testament, of the manner in which our Lord himself instituted the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; and let the reader now compare what he did and said, with what the priest says and does when he celebrates Mass.

1st. Our Lord Jesus Christ spoke in a language which his disciples understood.—But the Priest says Mass in Latin, which the people present do not understand.

2d. Jesus Christ spoke in a loud distinct voice, so as that the disciples heard him.—But the Priest mutters over in a low secret whisper, what are called the words of consecration, so that no one present can hear or understand what he says.

3d. Jesus Christ said, "This chalice is the New Testament in my blood."—But the Priest says that he said, "This is the chalice of my blood of the New and Eternal Testament, mystery of

Questions and Answers.

1. *Q.*—What is the leading office of the priests of the Church of Rome?

---

the faith," which is not true, as we may learn from the sentences at the beginning of this tract.

4th. JESUS CHRIST broke the bread, before he pronounced the words THIS IS MY BODY, which the Roman Catholics call the words of consecration, and by virtue of which they say, that the bread is transubstantiated into the body of Christ.—BUT THE PRIEST pronounces these words first, and then handles the Host, to make the people think he breaks the body of Christ; so that if the pronouncing the words of consecration be what changes the bread into Christ's body, the bread our Lord broke was not so changed, and therefore was a different thing from the Host.

5th. JESUS CHRIST gave the bread into the hands of the disciples.—BUT THE PRIEST puts the wafer into the mouth of each communicant himself.

6th. JESUS CHRIST gave his disciples a cup of wine, saying, *Drink ye all of this.* St Paul said to the Corinthians, "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread *and drink of that cup*," 1 Cor. xi. 28; and again, "As oft as ye eat this bread, and drink this chalice, ye shall show the Lord's death until he come," ver. 26. So that it is as plain as possible, that all present did drink as well as eat —BUT THE PRIEST alone drinks the wine, the laity only eat the wafer.

7th. JESUS CHRIST gave the disciples what the Scripture calls bread, and what was in the chalice he called wine, or the fruit of the vine.—BUT THE PRIEST in the Mass gives the people what he says is not bread, but the body of Christ, and drinks himself, what he says is not wine, but the blood of Christ.

8th. JESUS CHRIST did not elevate either the bread or the wine. —BUT THE PRIEST lifts up the Host, and the people worship it.

9th. JESUS CHRIST did not speak of any sacrifice being offered to God in this ordinance which he then instituted.—BUT THE PRIEST professes to offer in the Mass the Body of Christ as a sacrifice for the sins of the quick and the dead.

10th. JESUS CHRIST said no prayers for the dead.—BUT THE PRIEST prays for those *who sleep the sleep of peace.* Now this prayer must have been added to the Mass before purgatory was invented, because if a soul is tormented in the fire of purgatory, it cannot be the sleep of peace; and if it is in heaven, it has no need of prayers.

11th. JESUS CHRIST said nothing of Saints or Angels.—BUT THE PRIEST mentions both, blessing the incense through Michael the Archangel, and praying God to command an Angel to carry the consecrated Host to heaven.

12th. JESUS CHRIST said, "Do this in remembrance of ME."—BUT THE PRIEST says, "solemnizing and communicating in the first place the remembrance of the *glorious Mary*, ever Virgin."

13th. JESUS CHRIST instituted this Sacrament as a remembrance of his death and suffering, whereby remission of sin is

A.—To sacrifice the real body, blood, soul, and deity, of Christ.

2. *Q.*—Did Christ commission His Apostles to offer sacrifice?

---

granted to those who believe on his name.—BUT THE PRIEST says Mass for the purpose of obtaining from God some temporal blessing, as the cure of a sick person, or of sick cattle, preservation of the crops from frost or blight; and thus there are many kinds of Masses: as the Mass of St Giles, of St Francis, St Catharine, and others: there are also loud Masses and low Masses, great Masses and small Masses, day Masses, episcopal Masses; Masses in white, in green, in violet, and all other colours.

14th. JESUS CHRIST instituted the Sacrament after supper.—BUT THE PRIEST says Mass fasting.

15th. JESUS CHRIST says nothing about the Cross on which he was to die.—BUT THE PRIEST, in the Mass on Good-Friday, which is called the Mass of the pre-sanctified, says to the people, "Behold the wood of the Cross, come let us worship;" and an anthem sung on that day contains these words, "We worship thy Cross, O Lord;" and speaking to the Cross they say, "Faithful Cross, the only noble among the Trees."

16th. JESUS CHRIST did not command the bread to be carried in procession, or say, what was to be done with the crumbs.—BUT THE PRIEST carries the Host in procession, in all places where the Roman Catholic Religion is established. There is a canon in their Church, to tell what is to be done when a mouse eats or bites the body of Christ: another, to direct what is to be done when it is lost, or carried away by the wind: another orders the Priest to swallow a fly or spider, if it fall into the cup, unless it turn his stomach; and that if the blood freeze in winter, to wrap the chalice in hot cloths. But the most notable one is that which directs, that if the priest be sick, and throw the wafer off his stomach, he should, if possible, swallow it again! Who can believe, that things so absurd and so nauseous are to be derived from the simple account of the New Testament?

Here are sixteen particulars, in which the celebration of Mass contradicts the institution of the Sacrament by our Lord himself; and we can here see, that the Church of Rome has, without any authority from the Scripture, altered some things, left out some things, and added some things, so as to make the Mass quite different from the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and to prove plainly, that no Romanist has ever yet received this Sacrament. He has never commemorated the shedding of Christ's blood for the remission of sins, for he never drank of the sacramental cup. He never commemorated Christ in this ordinance, for he is taught to commemorate the Virgin Mary; and he never could understand what the priest said in many of the prayers, because they were in Latin. The service he attends is not founded on the Scriptures, but on the commands of *the Church;* and let him recollect that Christ has said, "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men," Matt. xv. 9.

A.—No. He commands them to preach the Gospel; but He makes no allusion to sacrifice.

3. *Q.*—In the Acts of the Apostles an account is given of the assemblies for worship of the early Christians. Is there any allusion to the offering up of sacrifice in these assemblies?

A.—No. We read of prayer and praise, of the administration of the sacraments, and of the preaching of the Gospel; but there is not one word as to sacrifice.

4. *Q.*—The Apostle gives many exhortations to Timothy and Titus for the government of the churches, and on their duties in general. Does he refer to the offering up of a literal sacrifice?

A.—He speaks of prayer, and preaching the Word, and other duties; but he makes no allusion to the sacrifice of the Mass.

5. *Q.*—Are there any sacrificing priests under the Gospel dispensation?

A.—No. Christ is the only priest.

6. *Q.*—What reasons can you assign for believing that there are no sacrificing priests?

A.—The Apostle gives three reasons for the abolition of the Jewish priesthood, which prove that there can be no carnal sacrifices now.

7. *Q.*—What are these reasons?

A.—They are specified in Hebrews vii. 23–28. The Jewish priesthood were unprofitable,—1. Because they were "*many;*" 2. Because they needed to offer up sacrifices for their own sins; and, 3. Because they were men of infirmity. These reasons apply with equal force to the Romish priesthood.

8. *Q.*—The sacrifice of the Mass is an unbloody offering. How do you prove that it therefore cannot be efficacious?

A.—Because it is written, "Without shedding of "blood is no remission," Heb. ix. 22.

9. *Q.*—How does the Epistle to the Hebrews condemn the sacrifice of the Mass?

A.—Because it distinctly states, that Christ was "*once*

"offered," which destroys the Romish notion that He is continuously offered in the Mass.

CHAPTER XV.

Communion in One Kind.

FIFTH ARTICLE OF THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV.

"I profess likewise, that in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead. And that in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist, there are truly, really, and substantially the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood: which conversion the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation. I also confess, that under either kind alone, Christ is received whole and entire, and a true sacrament."—*Extracted from the* "Ordo Administrandi Sacramenti," p. 67. London, 1840.

THOUGH Christ instituted the sacraments under both kinds, bread and wine, yet the Church of Rome withholds the cup from the laity, and grants it only to the priest officiating in the Mass.

Romish Arguments in favour of Communion in one Kind.

Let us notice her arguments in favour of this practice. We quote from the *Grounds of Catholic Doctrine*,—

"*A.*—Yes: 1*st.* All such texts as promise everlasting life to them that receive, though but in one kind; as John vi. 51, 'The bread that I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world; (ver. 57) He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him; (ver. 58) He that eateth me, the same also shall live by me.'"—P. 31. Dublin, 1838.

We have already proved, under the head of Transubstantiation, that the 6th of John does not refer to the Lord's Supper. If it did, however, as we before observed, this very passage would prove that no layman has eternal life; for he is robbed of the cup, and cannot therefore *drink* the blood of Christ.

The *Grounds of Catholic Doctrine* proceeds,—

"2*dly*. All such texts as make mention of the faithful receiving the holy communion under the name of breaking of bread without

any mention of the cup; as Acts ii. 42, 'They were persevering in the doctrine of the apostles, and in the communication of the breaking of bread, and in prayers;' (ver. 46) 'Continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house.' (Acts xx 7) 'And on the first day of the week, when we assembled to break bread.' (Luke xxiv. 30, 31,) 'He took bread, and blessed, and break, and gave to them; and their eyes were opened, and they knew him: and he vanished out of their sight.' (1 Cor. x. 17,) 'We being many, are one bread, one body, all who partake of one bread.'"—P. 31. *Ibid.*

It quotes the following texts:—

Acts 2. 42. And they continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers. V 43. And fear came upon every soul: and many wonders and signs were done by the apostles. V 44. And all that believed were together, and had all things common; V 45. And sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need. V 46. And they, continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart.

Acts 20. 7. And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight.

Luke 24. 30. And it came to pass, as he sat at meat with them, he took bread, and blessed it, and brake, and gave to them. V 31. And their eyes were opened, and they knew him; and he vanished out of their sight.

Cor. 10. 17. For we, being many, are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread.

Assuming that all these texts refer to the Lord's Supper, we answer, that they are merely *incidental* notices of the manner in which the Apostles discharged their duties. Such *incidental* reference to that sacrament cannot authorise the superseding of *the original institution;* for the *full* account of which we must ever go back to the passages where we find the details recorded.

It is perfectly absurd to argue, that one part of the institution was abrogated, because, at each reference to it, all the details are not recapitulated! As well might it be urged, that the blessing is unnecessary, *because there is no special mention of it;* or that there could be no unworthy reception of the ordinance, *because, in every instance, such unworthy reception is not denounced!*

The *Grounds of Catholic Doctrine* further says,—

"3*dly*. 1 Cor. xi. 27. Where the apostle declares, that whosoever receives under either kind unworthily, is guilty both of the body and blood of Christ, 'Whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.' Where the Protestant translators have evidently corrupted the text by putting in *and drink*, instead of '*or drink*,' as it is in the original."—Ibid.

In reply to this quotation, we answer,—

I. That, even if we accept the Romish translation, the text proves, that the sin of partaking unworthily of the Sacrament, may be committed with reference either to the bread, *or* to the wine.

II. This fact, founded on the Romish translation, that the sin of partaking unworthily, may be committed with reference either to the bread, *or* to the wine, proves that both bread *and* wine were administered to the communicant; for how else could a man commit the sin of partaking unworthily *of the wine*, if the wine were not given to him?

III. We deny that our version is incorrect,—1. The particle (ἤ) sometimes signifies "and," as well as "or." Robert Constantine, a Romish lexicographer, admits this. 2. The Alexandrian manuscript, and others, read καί, and not ἤ. 3. Many versions—the most ancient, the Syriac, the Coptic, the Æthiopic, and some Arabic—translate the passage as in our version. 4. More remarkable still, many *old* editions of the Vulgate—the version alone recognised by the Church of Rome—translate the passage as we do. Copies of the Vulgate may be seen in the British Museum, in proof of this. Pope Sextus V. adopted the old Vulgate, and denounced anathema against the man who should alter it in the smallest particle (*minima particula*); yet, strange to say, Clement VIII., another infallible Pope, published another edition of the Vulgate, altered in many particulars, and in *this*.

We quote the following observations from Mr Venn's excellent letters to Mr Waterworth:—

"II. But I will now show that our translation of this text, so far from being a 'horrible mistranslation,' is *no mistranslation at all*.

"(1.) The particle (ἤ) which we here translate 'and,' does sometimes signify 'and,' as well as 'or.' It appears to be so used even in *classical* Greek; for Scapula says, that it is supposed to be so used both by Thucydides and Homer. But in the *New Testament* it is so used beyond a doubt. Thus Schleusner observes, that it has a conjunctive power, signifying 'and.' And Robert Constantine, one of your own lexicographers, says that it is sometimes used for καὶ (and), and instances Rom. iv. 13. Nay, the *Roman Catholic Translators themselves* so translate it in many places. I have myself found several instances of this in the Belfast Testament of 1839; and in the early editions of your English translation they are still more frequent. As this particle, therefore, is capable of both meanings, our Translators were at full liberty to select that meaning which appeared to them to be most suitable to the sense and context of the passage.

"(2.) *Some Greek manuscripts*—and the *Alexandrine* amongst them—read καὶ and not ἤ, And if this be the right reading, then our translation is of course the most natural.

"(3.) So far from our Translators being *the first* to adopt this translation, *they had numerous and good precedents for it.* To say nothing of several *very ancient Authors:* the oldest and most valuable *versions;*—viz. the Syriac, the Coptic, the Æthiopic, and three editions of the Arabic, have it as it is in our Bibles!—And what will you say, Sir (for of course you must have been profoundly ignorant of the fact, or you would never have committed yourself as you have), when I inform you, that not only a great many other early versions, but even *a great many old editions of the Vulgate itself*—the one authorised version of your Church—*have this translation which you designate as so 'horrible,' and as having been made by our Translators for the purpose of excluding the doctrine of communion in one kind?*—I will here quote the statement (somewhat abridged) of the late Mr Blair in his 'Revival of Popery;' and for its substantial accuracy, I am quite ready to vouch:—

"'FIRST, I find it stated in p. 492, vol. iii. of Curæ Philologicæ et Criticæ Wolfii, 4to, Basil, 1741, that more than thirty of the earliest printed editions of the Vulgate translation, between the years 1462 and 1569, have *et biberit* [*and* shall drink]. SECONDLY, he states that the Missals, both printed and manuscript copies, likewise read *et biberit.* THIRDLY, I have myself examined such printed editions of the Vulgate Latin as came in my way, and have found *above sixty* of them to contain the same rendering of the text. In the FOURTH place, I have consulted several manuscripts of the Vulgate, some at the British Museum, others in the libraries of private individuals (whom I can name), in which I found *et biberit*, &c., not *vel* or *aut biberit.* FIFTHLY, some of the very oldest translations into German, French, &c., made from the Vulgate by Roman Catholics themselves, agree in the disputed passage with ours. SIXTHLY, not merely do the printed versions agree, but likewise different manuscript translations which I examined.—It is particularly to be noticed, that, among the editions of the Latin Vulgate to which I allude above, as being examined by myself, as some of peculiar value; for instance, the very first Bible ever printed by FUST and GUTTENBERG (called the Mazarine Bible),

about the year 1450, or soon after, but without a date; the celebrated copy in the POLYGLOTT of Cardinal XIMENES, with the authority of Pope Leo the Tenth; the early Bible of Eggerstein, about 1468; also, that with the notes of NICOLAS DE LYRA: PETER COMESTOR'S Commentary on St Paul's Epistles, written in the middle of the 12th century; the Bible of the Louvain Doctors, that of the Paris Divines: the grand Polyglott of Antwerp; the Bible of the Salamanca University; and a multitude of others, highly important, which it would be tedious to particularise.'—Pp. 250, 251." Hereford, 1845, p. 106.

Romish Reasons for withholding the Cup.

The *Grounds of Catholic Doctrine* proceeds,—

"*Q.*—What are the reasons why the Church does not give the communion to all her children in both kinds?

"*A.*—1*st.* Because of the danger of spilling the blood of Christ, which could hardly be avoided, if all were to receive the cup.

"2*dly.* Because, considering how soon wine decays, the sacrament could not well be kept for the sick in both kinds.

"3*dly.* Because some constitutions can neither endure the taste nor smell of wine.

"4*thly.* Because true wine, in some countries, is very hard to be met with.

"5*thly.* In fine, in opposition to those heretics that deny that Christ is received, whole and entire, under either kind."—P. 31. Dublin, 1838.

What puerile reasons! and what an insult to the Divine Founder of the Sacrament! Let us view them one after another:—

1. It seems that Rome is more considerate than Christ, who instituted in both kinds.

2. If the wine be changed into the blood of Christ really, truly, and substantially, and miraculously, it is rather strange that it should decay at all.

3. What a pity that the blessed Jesus did not know this! Would not this reason, however, apply as much to the priesthood? or are they better fitted to endure the taste and smell of wine?

4. The *Missal* declares, that if the bread be not purely wheaten, the sacrament is not formed. There are places and times when it would be difficult, if not impossible, to procure such bread. Is this a reason against the sacrament of bread?

5. It is unchristian to do anything for mere opposi-

tion. How different is the rule of the Apostle, stated in 1 Cor. x. 31!

If Christ is whole and entire in the bread, of what use is the cup, or *vice versa!* The very fact, that there are two kinds, destroys the Romish notion.

Such are the only arguments and reasons which can be advanced in favour of mutilating the institution of our Lord.

Reasons against Communion in one Kind.

We now adduce our reasons against such mutilation,—

I. Both Kinds Instituted by Christ.—Christ instituted under both kinds, and said,—

Matt. 26. 27. Drink ye all of it.

1 Cor. 11. 25. This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.

Do what?—receive the bread *and* wine in remembrance of Him.

Romanists say in answer, that the exhortation was given only to Apostles.

To this we rejoin,—1. That if, for that reason, the cup should be given only to priests, the bread, for the same reason, should be given only to that order. If the Romish answer would prove anything, it would prove that the laity have no part or lot in the sacrament, and that it was only instituted for priests.

2. If the command, "Do *this*," &c., belonged only to the Apostles,* then we are not authorised to continue the ordinance.

II. Half Communion admitted to be a Novelty.—It is admitted by Councils and most eminent doctors of the Church of Rome, that communion in one kind is a novelty.

The Council of Constance says,—

"Though Christ instituted this venerable sacrament under both kinds, and though, in the Primitive Church, this sacrament was received by the faithful under both kinds, yet this custom, that it should be received by laymen under the kind of bread only, is to

* See *Grounds of Catholic Doctrine*, p. 30.

be held for a law which may not be refused."—*Col.* 100, *Labbe et Cossart.* 1672.

Cassander, a candid divine, says,—

"It is sufficiently manifest, that the universal Church of Christ until this day, and the Western or Roman Church for more than a thousand years after Christ, did exhibit the sacrament in both kinds to all the members of Christ's Church, at least in public, as it is most evident by innumerable testimonies both of Greek and Latin Fathers."—P. 981. *Consultatio.* Paris, 1616.

Fisher, the Jesuit, who maintained the controversy with White in the seventeenth century, says,—

"Certain it is that the Primitive Church did very often and frequently use the communion under both kinds; yea, they were bound thereunto by the obligation of custom, not Divine precept." —*White against Fisher in the chapter Of Both Kinds.*

Lyra, the great commentator of the fourteenth century, says,—

"In the first of the Corinthians and the eleventh, there is mention made of the communion in both kinds; for in the Primitive Church it was given in both kinds to the faithful."—*Lyra in* 1 Cor. xi. *in vetus et Novum Testamentum sine loco aut anno sed argent, I.* Mentelin, 1473.

Saint Thomas Aquinas, the great schoolman before the Reformation, says,—

"According to the ancient custom of the Church, all those that were partakers of the communion of His body, were partakers also of the communion of His blood."—Vol. iii. p. 523, col. 1. Venet. 1775.

Questions and Answers.

1. *Q.*—What argument do Romanists profess to found upon the 6th of John, in favour of Communion in One Kind?

A.—They say that it is sufficient to eat the bread; for Christ says, "The bread that I will give is my flesh, "which I will give for the life of the world," John vi. 51.

2. *Q.*—What answer do you give to this?

A.—We have already proved that the 6th chapter of John does not refer directly to the sacrament. Besides, if it did, it would prove that no Roman Catholic can have life, for he does not receive the cup, John vi. 53.

3. *Q.*—What general answer do you give to the texts

quoted by Romanists, in which breaking of bread is spoken of?

A.—The texts merely contain an *incidental* notice, upon which no positive argument can be founded.

4. *Q.*—What reasons can you give for the correctness of the Protestant version, "Whosoever shall eat this "bread, *and* drink this cup," 1 Cor. xi. 27.

A.—1. The particle ἤ sometimes means *and*, as well as *or*; 2. The Alexandrian Manuscripts, and others, read καὶ (and); 3. Many ancient versions give our translation; 4. Many old editions of the *Vulgate* give the same.

5. *Q.*—Have Roman Catholic authorities admitted, that Communion in One Kind is a novelty?

A.—Yes. The Council of Constance and several theologians.

6. *Q.*—Why should the cup be given to the laity?

A.—Because Christ instituted under *both* kinds, and gave in both kinds.

CHAPTER XVI.

Purgatory.

SIXTH ARTICLE OF THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV.

"I constantly hold that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful."—*Extracted from the* "Ordo Administrandi Sacramenti," p. 67. London, 1840.

THE Council of Trent declares, that there is a place of punishment called Purgatory, and that souls confined therein, are assisted by the prayers of the faithful, *Session* 25.

The Mass is said to be offered for those in Purgatory, as well as the living. See the Fifth Article of the *Creed of Pope Pius IV.*

The Council of Trent has not defined the nature of purgatorial torment; but the Catechism of that Council declares, that it is by fire, in the following passage:—

"Besides, there is a purgatorial *fire* (ignis), *tormented* in which,

the souls of the pious make *expiation* for a certain period, that an entrance may be opened for them into that eternal country where nothing that defileth can enter."—See *Catechism on the Fifth Article of the Creed.*

The Grounds of Catholic Doctrine says,—

"*Q.*—What is the doctrine of the Church as to this point?

"*A.*—We constantly hold, that there is a Purgatory; and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful. That is, by the prayers and alms offered for them, and principally by the holy sacrifice of the Mass.

"*Q.*—What do you mean by Purgatory?

"*A.*—A middle state of souls, who depart this life in God's grace, yet not without some lesser stains or guilt or punishment, which retard them from entering heaven. But as to the particular place where these souls suffer, or the quality of the torments which they suffer, the Church has decided nothing.

"*Q.*—What sort of Christians then go to Purgatory?

"*A.*—1*st.* Such as die guilty of lesser sins, which we commonly call venial; as many Christians do, who either, by sudden death or otherwise, are taken out of this life before they have repented for these ordinary failings.

"2*dly.* Such as have been formerly guilty of greater sins, and have not made full satisfaction for them to Divine Justice."—P. 34. Dublin, 1838.

From these authorities we learn,—1. That, according to the Council of Trent, Purgatory is a place of torment; 2. According to the Catechism of the same Council, a place of *fiery* torment; 3. That Purgatory is designed for the expiation of venial sin, and the temporal punishment due to transgression.

Bellarmine gives several anecdotes of persons who had appeared on earth from Purgatory, and described it as a place of excruciating woe. Its torments are thus spoken of in his treatise on Purgatory:—

Of St Christina, he says,—

"'Immediately as I departed from the body, my soul was received by ministers of light, and angels of God, and conducted to a dark and horrid place, filled with the souls of men. *The torments which I there witnessed, are so dreadful, that to attempt to describe them would be utterly in vain; and there I beheld not a few who had been known to me while they were alive.* Greatly concerned for their hapless state, I asked what place it was, thinking it was hell; but I was told, that it was Purgatory, where are kept those who, in their life, had repented indeed of their sins, but had not paid the punishment due for them. I was next taken to see the torments of hell, where also I recognised some of my former acquaintance upon earth. Afterwards I was translated into Paradise, even to the throne of the Divine Majesty; and when I saw

the Lord congratulating me, I was beyond measure rejoiced, concluding, of course, that I should henceforward dwell with Him for evermore. But he presently said to me, "In very deed, my sweetest daughter, here you shall be with me; but, for the present, I offer you your choice. Will you stay for ever with me now? or will you return to the earth, and there in your mortal body, but without any detriment to it, endure punishments, by which you may deliver out of Purgatory all those souls whom you so much pitied, and may also, by the sight of your penance, and the example of your life, be a means of converting to me some who are yet alive in the body, and so come again to me at last, with a great increase of your merits?" I accepted, without hesitation, the return to life, on the condition proposed; and the Lord congratulating me on the promptitude of my obedience, ordered that my body should be restored to me. And here I had an opportunity of admiring the incredible celerity of the blessed spirits; for, in that very hour, having been placed before the throne of God at the first recital of the Agnus Dei, in the Mass, which was said for me, at the third my body was restored. This is an account of my death, and return to life.' The author of her life then narrates, that 'she walked into burning ovens, and though she was so tortured by the flames that her anguish extorted from her the most horrible cries, yet, when she came out, there was not a trace of any burning to be detected on her body. Again, during a hard frost, she would go and place herself under the frozen surface of a river, for six days and more at a time. Sometimes she would be carried round by the wheel of a water-mill, with the water of the river, and having been whirled round in a horrible manner, she was as whole in body as if nothing had happened to her; not a limb was hurt. At other times she would make all the dogs in the town fall upon her, and would run before them like a hunted beast; and yet, in spite of being torn by thorns and brambles, and worried and lacerated by the dogs, to such a degree, that no part of her body escaped without wounds, there was not a weal nor scar to be seen.' 'Such,' says the illustrious and learned Cardinal Bellarmine, 'is the narrative of Thomas Cantepratensis; and that he said nothing but the truth, is evident, not only from the confirmation given to his testimony by the bishop, and Cardinal de Vitriaco, and from his only telling what happened in the very province in which he was a bishop, but because the thing spoke for itself. It was quite plain, that the body must have been endued with a Divine virtue, which could endure all that hers endured, without being damaged; and this, not for a few days, but for forty-two years, during which she continued alive after her resurrection. But still more manifest does this become, from the many sinners whom she brought to penitence, and from the miracles, after her death, by which she was distinguished; for God determined to stop the mouth of unbelievers.'"—Book ii., chap. 9, *De gemitu Columbæ*.

Purgatory is based upon the supposed existence of venial sin, and the extension, to another world, of the temporal punishment of sin.

We must therefore first consider the subject of venial sin.

Romish Arguments for Venial Sin.

The Abridgement of Christian Doctrine sets forth the views of the Church of Rome on this point, and the arguments which are urged in its favour,—

"*Q.*—How is actual sin divided?

"*A.*—Into mortal and venial.

"*Q.*—What is mortal sin?

"*A.*—Any great offence against the law of God; and is so called, because it kills the soul, and robs it of the spiritual life of grace.

"*Q.*—What is venial sin?

"*A.*—A small and very pardonable offence against God, or our neighbour.

"*Q.*—How prove you that some sins are mortal?

"*A.*—First, out of Rom. vi. 23, 'For the stipend of sin is death.' And verse 21, 'What fruit, therefore, had you then in those things for which ye are now ashamed, for the end of them is death.'

"Secondly, out of Wis. xvi. 14, 'For man, by malice, killeth his own soul.' And out of Ezek. xviii. 4, 'The soul that sinneth, the same shall die.'

"*Q.*—How prove you that some sins are venial?

"*A.*—First, out of St John i. 8, where, speaking of such as walk in the light, and are cleansed from all mortal sin by the blood of Christ, he adds, 'If we will say we have not sin, we seduce ourselves, and the truth is not in us.'

"Secondly, 'In many things we all offend,' (St James iii. 2). And in Prov. xxiv. 16, 'The just man falleth seven times.' Not mortally, for then he were no longer just, therefore venially.

"Thirdly, out of St Matt. xii. 36, 'But I say unto you, every idle word which men shall speak, they shall render an account for it at the day of judgment.' Now, God forbid every idle word should be a mortal sin. The just, also, in the Lord's Prayer, say daily, 'Forgive us our trespasses.'"—P. 113. Dub. 1841.

We maintain, not that all sin is equally heinous in its character, but that all sin is mortal, or deserves death.

1. The text adduced above, in order to prove that *some* sins are mortal, proves that *all* sins are so,—

Rom. 6. 23. For the (stipend or) wages of sin is death.

The Apostle does not say of some sin, but "of sin," *including all.*

2. The Apostle does not say that the blood of Christ cleanseth from "all mortal sin," but all sin. The insertion of the word *mortal* in the Catechism as above, is

a direct misrepresentation. 3. The words of the Apostle are not, "If we say that we have no venial sin," but "sin" without any qualification. All sin is mortal, or deserving of death. The blood of Christ atones for its guilt, so that the Christian does not pay the forfeit. 4. Observe the fallacy of the argument. "The just "man falleth seven times, not mortally, for then he were "no longer just, but venially." Let this argument be carried out, and it would prove, that the just man cannot commit mortal sin! David was a just man. Was his terrible fall but venial? Peter denied our Lord; was that venial? 5. Even an idle word would be found a mortal sin, were "judgment laid to the line, "and righteousness to the plummet." It would indicate a heart not completely in conformity with the law of God. If idle words were so venial, why render an account for them in the day of judgment? 6. "The "just, also, in the Lord's Prayer, say daily, 'Forgive "us our trespasses.'" This argument implies, if it mean anything, that the just in that petition only ask the forgiveness of venial sin! What a misrepresentation of the words of our Lord! The original in Matt. vi. 12, is *οφειληματα*, debts (the debt of sin); in Luke xi. 4, *αμαρτιας*, sins. The just man, forsooth, is to pray to God to forgive him his venial sins in this prayer, but to reserve his mortal sins for the ear and absolution of the priest in the confessional!

All sin, we maintain, is mortal, or deserving of death; though, for the sake of Jesus' atonement, the debt is cancelled in the case of the believer. "Sin is "the transgression of the law;" and, it is written,—

Gal. 3. 10. Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.

James 2. 10. For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all.

The taking of an apple appeared a trifling offence, yet reflect on the consequences.

The Romish Doctrine Immoral.

The Abridgement of Christian Doctrine asks,—

"What are the effects of venial sin?

"It doth not *rob* the soul of life as mortal sin doth, but *only* weakeneth the fervour of charity, and, by degrees, disposeth unto mortal."—P. 114. *Ibid.*

How immoral such doctrine! We know how ready is corrupt human nature to grasp at any excuse for sin, and how readily this distinction may facilitate its commission.

The Church of Rome, however, notwithstanding her infallible authority, cannot detail in full what is venial sin. Whoever reads *The Moral Theologies*, as published by Liguori, Dens, and others, will at once perceive that doctors differ on this most important point. What is mortal sin according to one divine, is venial according to another. See, for instance, the treatise *De Matrimonio*, written with a view especially to the confessional. Amid disgusting details, fine drawn arguments are adduced by opposing theologians, to prove that certain actions are venial and others mortal. Were Rome consistent, she would be enabled to give, infallibly and at full length, a catalogue of venial sins, as distinguished from mortal. Her infallibility is of no practical use.

Temporal Punishment does not exist beyond the Grave.—The arguments for the temporal punishment of sin, when the eternal guilt is remitted, founded upon the chastisement of David and others, just fail *at the point which needs to be proved.*

The Church of Rome teaches, that such punishment is continued after death in Purgatory; and here is the point where the arguments fail. The chastisement of David and others, does not prove that they were punished *after death*, which is the main point of dispute. Until Rome prove that Christians are punished in the next life, her case is not made out. As to the punishment of Christians in this world, temporally, for their sins, we say, that such discipline is not *penal* or *propitiatory*, but corrective. "For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, "and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth," Heb. xii. 6. We shall show, by and by, that there is no punishment for the Christian after death.

Texts quoted in favour of Purgatory.

Certain texts are quoted by some Roman Catholics in favour of Purgatory,—

I. Matt. 5. 25. Agree with thine adversary quickly, whiles thou art in the way with him; lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. V 26. Verily I say unto thee, Thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing.

If this refer to spiritual matters at all, it proves that the sinner is a debtor to God—the creditor. He is cast into prison till he pay the uttermost farthing,—which is for ever; because he has nothing wherewith to pay. The use of the word "till," does not necessarily imply a definite or temporary confinement; for the Douay Bible, in its comment on Matt. i. 25, quotes various texts to show that it refers to "what is done, without "any regard to the future." For instance, "I am *till* "you grow old. Who dare infer," says the Douay Bible, "that God should then cease to be?"*

Besides, the Romanist cannot consistently prove anything by this passage, for the Fathers disagree in their

* The Commentary of the Douay Annotators on Matthew i. 25, is as follows:—

"Ver. 25.—*Till she brought forth her first-born son.* From these words Helvidius and other heretics most impiously inferred, that the blessed Virgin Mary had other children besides Christ: But St Jerome shows, by divers examples, that this expression of the Evangelist was a manner of speaking usual among the *Hebrews*, to denote by the word *until* only what is done, without any regard to the future. Thus it is said, Gen. chap. viii. ver. 6 and 7, That *Noah sent forth a raven, which went forth and did not return till the waters were dried up on the earth,*—that is, did not return any more. Also, Isaias, chap xlvi. ver. 4, God says, *I am* TILL *you grow old.* Who dare infer that God should then *cease to be?* Also, in the first book of *Maccabees*, ver. 54, *And* they went up *to Mount Zion with joy and gladness, and offered holocausts, because not one of them was slain till they had returned in peace,*—that is, not one was, before or after they had returned. God saith to his Divine Son: *Sit on my right hand till I make thy enemies thy footstool.* Shall he sit no longer after his enemies are subdued? Yea, and for all eternity."

Here is an elaborate argument to show, that the word *till* does not always imply a definite period.

views of it. Where is the "unanimous consent" of the Fathers? Where the infallible sense of the Church?*

II. Matt. 12. 32. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him: but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come.

The parallel passages, however, in Mark iii. 29, and Luke xii. 10, show that the expression, "neither in this "world, nor in the world to come," in Matthew, is a strong mode of stating the truth, that he hath never forgiveness. But again, if, according to this passage, sins are forgiven in Purgatory, how, according to Matt. v. 25, 26, is the uttermost farthing *paid? If the debt be paid, it cannot be forgiven.*

III. 1 Cor. 3. 13. Every man's work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. V 14. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. V 15. If any man's work shall be burnt, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire.

1. This text cannot refer to Purgatory. The fire spoken of, *tries;* Purgatory *purifies.* 2. It is said that "*every* man's work shall be tried," ver. 13. If this referred to Purgatory, it would prove that every man must go there, which is not the doctrine of the Church of Rome, else saints might be in Purgatory *even when invoked.* 3. The Apostle refers alone to the work of ministers as builders of the Lord's visible temple, verses 5, 9, 10, not to the work of Christians in general. 4. The fire of tribulation, and the fiery ordeal of judgment at last, 2 Thess. i. 7, 8, shall prove whether ministers have built upon the foundation, either wood, hay,

* Jerome, in reference to Matt. v. 25, 26, says,—

"He will never come out, because he will *always* pay the last farthing, *whilst he pays the eternal punishment of his sins.*"—On the Lamentations of Jeremiah, book i. c. 1, vol. v. p. 684.

Even Maldonatus, the Jesuit, confesses, that the prison here referred to is hell.

"*Carcer infernus.*"—P. 121, *Mogunt,* 1596.

The Fathers are divided in their sentiments as to the way, the adversary, the officers, the prison, and the last farthing. Chrysostom, according to Bellarmine, thinks, that this exhortation of the Saviour relates literally to this life.

and stubble—unbelievers; or gold, silver, and precious stones—believers. 5. *Works*, not *persons*, are tried. 6. If the minister's work abide, he shall receive a reward, "the joy and crown of rejoicing." If not, he shall suffer loss in much of his anticipated joy, though he himself shall be saved. 7. The Fathers are disagreed on this passage. Where is "their unanimous con- "sent?"* Where is the infallible sense of the Church?

* Without which, the Romanist professes not to interpret Scripture.—See Second Article of *Pope Pius's Creed.*

Bellarmine bears testimony to the diversity of opinion which existed amongst the Fathers on 1 Cor. iii. 13–15. He says,—

"*Secondly*, The Apostle clearly makes a distinction between the works and the workmen, and says, concerning that fire, that it shall burn the works, but not the workers; for he says, if any one's work shall remain, and if any work shall burn: but the fire of purgatory, which is a true and real fire, cannot burn works, which are transitory actions, and have already passed. *Lastly*, it would follow, that all men, even the most holy, would pass through the fire of purgatory, and be saved by fire, for all are to pass through the fire of which we are speaking. But that all are to pass through the fire of purgatory, and to be saved by fire, is clearly false; for the Apostle here openly says, that only those who build wood and hay are to be saved as by fire: the Church also has always been persuaded, that holy martyrs and infants dying after baptism, are presently received into heaven, without any passage through fire, as the Council of Florence teaches in its last session. It remains, therefore, that we should say, that the Apostle here speaks of the fire of the severe and just judgment of God, which is not a purging or punishing fire, but one that probes and examines. Thus Ambrose explains it on Psalm cxviii., and also Sedulius.

"The fifth and last difficulty is, what is understood by the fire, when he says, 'but he shall be saved, yet so as by fire?'

"*Some understand the tribulations* of *this life;* but this cannot properly be said, because, then, even he who built gold and silver would be saved by fire. Wherefore, Augustine and Gregory, who are the authors of this opinion, when they were not satisfied with it, proposed another, of which we shall speak by and by. *Some understand it to be eternal fire, as Chrysostom and Theophylact;* but this we have already refuted: others understand the fire of the conflagration of the world. It is, therefore, the common opinion of theologians,* that by the name of this fire, is understood some purgatorial and temporal fire, to which, after death, they are adjudged who are found on their trial to have built wood, hay, or stubble."—*De Purg.* lib. i. chap. 4.

* Romish Theologians.

IV. 1 Peter 3. 18. For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: V 19. By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; V 20. Which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water.

1. This can have no reference to the supposed prison of Purgatory. Those who are guilty of mortal sin, do not go to Purgatory. But those to whom Noah preached, were guilty of mortal sin, for they were *incredulous*, according to the Douay version of the passage; therefore they did not go to Purgatory. 2. Christ preached by the Holy Spirit to the antediluvians, "Quickened by "the Spirit, by *which* also he went and preached," &c. This implies that He did not preach in person. 3. He preached by *the Spirit* in Noah, who is therefore called "a preacher of righteousness." 4. The prison must mean either the prison of sin in which they were confined when alive, or the prison of hell, in which, being incredulous, the antediluvians were when Peter wrote. These texts alleged in favour of Purgatory, are so little to the point, that some Roman Catholics endeavour to prove the dogma by the authority of the Church alone.

Texts against Purgatory.

I. Purgatory inconsistent with complete Justification.—The doctrine of Purgatory contradicts the Scripture doctrine, that we are completely purged and justified by Christ.

Rom. 8. 1. There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. V 33. Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth; V 34. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.

Eph. 1. 7. In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace.

Eph. 4. 32. And be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you.

Col. 2. 13. And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses.

Heb. 1. 3. When he had *by himself purged our sins.*

1 John 1. 7. And the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from *all* sin.

Rev. 7. 14. These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.

When Christ purged our sins, was His work incomplete? Does the Apostle declare, that Christ's blood cleanseth from "*all* sin," and yet does some sin remain uncleansed? Could the robes of the just before the throne, have been washed in a more efficacious fountain? No! the work of Jesus is perfect; and every text which proves the completeness of that work, is an argument against Purgatory.

II. No Punishment to the Believer after Death.—The doctrine of Purgatory contradicts the blessed truth, that when the believer dies he enters into rest.

Luke 23. 42. And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise.

Paradise means the third heaven, or heaven of glory; for the Apostle, in 2 Cor. xii. 2, says, that he was caught up to "the third heaven," which, in the 4th verse, he declares was paradise.

The dying thief, though "crimsoned o'er" with guilt, was made white in the blood of the Lamb, and went from the cross to the crown.*

* It is evident that Christ's soul went into paradise when separated from the body.

Some think that there is a place of separate spirits, to which Christ went. This opinion should not be confounded with the notion of Purgatory; for there might be a hundred places, and yet no Purgatory, or place where souls are tortured as an expiation for their sins.

We believe, however, that there is no place of separate spirits but heaven or hell.

The statement in Psalm xvi. 10, taken in connection with the descent into hell, spoken of in the creed, is by some considered a difficulty. To us it presents none. The Psalmist evidently speaks of the body of Christ, which did not see corruption. Pearson, in his work on the Creed, though he does not take this view himself, yet candidly states the ARGUMENTS in its favour as follows:—

"The third opinion, which is also very late, at least in the manner of explication, is, that in those words, Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell, the soul of Christ is taken for His body, and hell for the grave; and consequently, in the Creed, He descended into hell, is no more than this, that Christ, in His body,

2 Cor. 5. 1. For we know, that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.

2 Cor. 5. 8. We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be *present* with the Lord.

Philip. 1. 21. For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain.

Philip. 1. 23. For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire *to depart and be with Christ;* which is far better.

Rev. 14. 13. And I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that *they may rest from their labours;* and their works do follow them.

In accordance with this truth, the family of God, the redeemed, are represented as being either *in heaven or earth.* Nothing is said of Purgatory,—

Eph. 3. 14. For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of

---

was laid into the grave. This explication ordinarily is rejected, by denying that the soul is ever taken for the body, or hell for the grave; *but in vain.* For it must be *acknowledged,* that sometimes the Scriptures are rightly so, *and cannot otherwise be understood* First, the same word in the Hebrew, which the Psalmist used, and in the Greek, which the Apostle used, and we translate the soul, is elsewhere used for the body of a dead man, and translated so. And when we read in Moses of a prohibition given to the high priest or the Nazarite, of going to or coming near a dead body, and of the pollution by the dead, *the dead body, in the Hebrew and the Greek, is nothing else but that which elsewhere signifieth the soul.* And Mr Ainsworth, who translated the Pentateuch nearer the letter than the sense, hath so delivered it, in compliance with the original phrase; and may be well interpreted thus by our translation, Ye shall not make in your flesh any cutting *for a soul,—that is, for the dead.* For a soul he shall not defile himself among His people,—that is, There shall none be defiled for the dead among His people. He that toucheth anything that is unclean *by a soul,—that is, by the dead.* Every one defiled *by a soul,—that is, by the dead.* He shall not come at *a dead soul,—that is,* He shall not come at a *dead body.* Thus Ainsworth's translation showeth, that in all these places, the original word is that which originally signifieth the soul; and our translation teacheth us, that though in other places it signifieth the soul, yet in these it must be taken for the body, and that body bereft of the soul.

"Secondly, The word which the Psalmist used in Hebrew, and the Apostle in Greek, and is translated hell, doth certainly, in some other places, signify *no more than the grave, and is translated so.* As where Mr Ainsworth followeth the word, For I will go down unto my son, mourning to hell,—our translation, aiming at the sense, rendereth it, For I will go down into the grave unto my son mourning. So again he, Ye shall bring down my gray hairs with sorrow unto hell,—that is, to the grave. And in this sense

our Lord Jesus Christ, V 15. Of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named.

If what Romanists say of purgatorial torments be true, those who die in the Lord do *not* rest from their labours; nor can the Christian entertain the delightful confidence, that to be absent from the body, is to be "with Christ," and "present with the Lord," "from henceforth."

Questions and Answers.

1. *Q.*—For whom do Romanists say that Purgatory is designed?

A.—For those who die in a state of venial sin, or who have not paid the debt of temporal punishment.

2. *Q.*—What is taught as to the Purgatorial state?

---

we say, The Lord killeth and maketh alive; He bringeth down to the grave, and bringeth up. Now, seeing the soul is sometimes taken for the body, deserted by the soul, and hell is sometimes also taken for the grave, the receptacle for the body dead; therefore it is conceived, that the prophet did intend these significations, in those words, Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell; and consequently the article grounded on that Scripture must import no more than this,—Christ, in repect of His body bereft of His soul, which was recommended into, and deposited in the hands of His Father, descended into the grave.

"This exposition hath that great advantage, that he which first mentioned this descent in the Creed, did not interpret it of the burial; and where this article was expressed, there that of the burial was omitted."—*Expos. of Creed on, "He descended into Hell."*

Thus it seems, that the descent into hell, spoken of in the Creed, meant a descent into the grave. And the redundancy of the expression, "He was dead, buried, and descended into hell," imports, as Bishop Burnet says, "that his soul was not as in a deep ecstasy or fit, that *seemed* death, but that He was truly dead; that His soul was neither in His body nor hovering about it, ascending and descending upon it, as some of the Jews fancied souls did for some time after death."—*Expos. of Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 72. Lond., 1839.

He adds, "In the first Creeds that have this article, Christ's burial not being mentioned in them, it follows from thence, as well as from Ruffin's own sense of it, that they understood this (He descended into hell) *only of Christ's burial.*"—*Ibid.*

"He was buried, and descended into hell," must be regarded as a redundant but strong mode of expressing the same truth.

He was really *dead and buried.*

Let it, however, be remembered, that the Creed is but of human composition.

A.—1. The Council of Trent teaches, that it is a state of torment; 2. The Catechism of that Council teaches, that it is a place of *fiery* torment; 3. And the works of Romish divines frequently detail the nature of the sufferings.

3. *Q.*—Upon what two doctrines is Purgatory founded?

A.—Venial sin, and the temporal punishment of sin after death.

4. *Q.*—Is there such a thing as venial sin?

A.—No. All sin is mortal, Romans vi. 23. One sin may be more heinous than another; but everything which falls short of the high standard of the law, is sin, and exposes the transgressor to the curse, Gal. iii. 10.

5. *Q.*—What error does the Church of Rome commit as to the temporal punishment of sin?

A.—She regards it as propitiatory and penal, whereas it is *corrective*, Heb. xii. 6.

6. *Q.*—Where does the Romish argument as to temporal punishment peculiarly fail?

A.—She teaches that it may extend beyond the grave. It is evident, on the contrary, that believers, when they die, enter into rest.

7. *Q.*—What general answer do you give to the argument founded on the four texts,—Matt. v. 25; Matt. xii. 32; 1 Cor. iii. 15; 1 Peter iii. 19, 20?

A.—They do not prove Purgatory,—1. The debt, according to Christ, must be paid to the uttermost farthing. This cannot refer to Purgatory, in which money and Mass may commute the punishment. The declaration is, in fact, a strong mode of stating the eternity of future punishment, for the sinner is in the position of the debtor who has nothing to pay. 2. This cannot refer to Purgatory, if there the debt must be paid. The Saviour speaks of *forgiveness*, of which there is none in Purgatory. The passage means, hath never forgiveness, Mark iii. 29. 3. This cannot refer to Purgatory, because it is a fire which *tries*, not purifies. It will try *every man's* work, but Purgatory is for those only, or applies only to those, who die in venial sin. It is the

fire of judgment, 1 Cor. iii. 13. 4. This cannot refer to Purgatory; because those who were in the prison were guilty of *mortal* sin. Christ, by *His Spirit* in Noah, 1 Peter iii. 19, preached to the inhabitants of the world at the time of the flood, who, when Peter wrote, were in the prison of hell.

8. *Q.*—Why do you reject Purgatory?

A.—1. Because it contradicts the blessed truth, that the Christian is completely justified and purged by Christ, Rom. viii. 1, 33, 34; Eph. i. 7; iv. 32; Col. ii. 13; Heb. i. 3; 1 John i. 7; Rev. vii. 14. 2. Because, when the believer dies, he enters into rest, Luke xxiii. 43; 2 Cor. v. 1; Philip. i. 21–23; Rev. xiv. 13.

There is a *fountain* filled with blood
Drawn from Immanuel's veins,
And sinners, plunged beneath that flood,
Lose all their guilty stains.

The dying thief rejoiced to see
That fountain in his day,
And there may I, as vile as he,
Wash *all* my sins away.

Atoning Lamb, thy precious blood
Shall never lose its power,
Till all the ransomed Church of God
Be saved to sin no more.

CHAPTER XVII.

Saint-Worship.

(PART FIRST.)

SEVENTH ARTICLE OF THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV.

"Likewise, that the saints reigning together with Christ, are to be honoured and invocated, and that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to be held in veneration."—*Extracted from the* "Ordo Administrandi Sacramenti," p. 67. London, 1840.

THE Church of Rome divides religious worship into three kinds:—1. *Latria*, due to God alone. 2. *Hyperdulia*, to the Virgin. 3. *Dulia*, to the saints. Such distinc-

tions are false in theory, and useless in practice. The word *dulia* not unfrequently denotes the service belonging to God; "Ye cannot serve (δουλεύειν, douleuein) *God* "and mammon," Matt. vi. 24.

The theory is useless, for it cannot be reduced to practice. Who can so nicely balance his feelings, as to give to God, the Virgin, and the saints, their due portion?

The only distinction of which worship admits, is that of civil and religious,—civil belonging to man, and *religious to God alone.* We bow the head to each other in salutation,—we kneel to the sovereign,—this is civil worship; but religious adoration is the exclusive prerogative of God.

It is necessary to inquire, What is religious worship? It is any action, whether outward or inward, of prayer and praise,—any outward homage exhibited by kneeling, bowing, prostration, or standing, (or any inward homage of the heart), connected with *spiritual* dependence, expressive of a sense of sin, or a desire for pardon of sin, or of thanks for mercy received. Such religious worship belongs to God alone.

We therefore define idolatry to be, "the giving of "*any religious* worship to a creature."

Religious Worship given to Mary.

In illustration of the worship practised by the Church of Rome, we give some specimens of her *Mariolatry*, or worship of the Virgin.

I. Festivals of Mary.—Festivals are instituted in honour of the Virgin as numerous as those of Christ himself. This is avowed in *The Devotions of the Sacred Heart*, a standard work among Romanists.

"'The Church, assisted and instructed by the Holy Spirit, gives to Mary titles which resemble those given to her Divine Son. Jesus is our King; *Mary is our Queen.* Jesus is our advocate and mediator; *Mary is also our advocate and mediatrix.* Jesus is our hope, our refuge, our consolation; *we say the same of Mary.* Jesus is the way which leads to heaven; *Mary is the gate of heaven.*'

"'Jesus is our guide and our light in the way of life; *Mary is the star which guides and conducts us to the harbour of salvation.*

Jesus is the author of grace; *Mary is the mother of grace.* In a word, Mary participates by grace in all the titles which Jesus enjoys by nature.'

"'But what is still more decisive, the Church unites Jesus and Mary in the honours which she renders them in their solemnities. So soon as there is introduced a feast, a ceremony, a practice of devotion to procure the glory of Jesus, so soon is there something of the like established in honour of Mary; and the Church which celebrates, by particular feasts, the mysteries of the Son, from His incarnation to His ascension, solemnises, in like manner, the mysteries of the Mother, from her conception to her assumption into heaven.' Thus we find, that festivals similar to those which are appointed in honour of Christ, belong to the Virgin. This work says, that Pius VII. granted a number of indulgences to the members of the sodality or society of the Sacred Heart, which is, therefore, based on the full sanction of the Church."—P. 43. Dub., 1840.

In reference to the Assumption of the Virgin, the lesson appointed for the 18th of August, devoted to commemorate the event, says (we quote it from *The Breviary*, with the Bishop of Exeter's observations):—

"Not only is the assumption of her body into heaven made to parallel our Lord's ascension, but that body itself is stated, like our Lord's, to have been miraculously preserved from corruption. On the fourth day of the week after the assumption (for a whole week is devoted to the honour of that event), a lesson is read, in which it is declared, that 'at the time of her glorious falling asleep' (her death), 'all the Apostles who were employed in their holy mission through the whole earth, for the salvation of mankind, were in a moment carried aloft through the air, and brought together to Jerusalem:—while they were there, they saw a vision of angels, and heard the hymns of the hosts of heaven, and *so with Divine glory she delivered her soul into the hands of God.* But her body was taken amidst the songs of angels and of the Apostles, and deposited in a coffin at Gethsemane, in which place the melody of angels continued for three days. At the end of those days, the Apostles opened the tomb, to enable Thomas, who alone had hitherto been absent, to fulfil a wish which he felt *to adore that body which had borne the Lord.* On opening it, the body was nowhere to be found, but only the grave-clothes in which it had been wrapped; and from them issued an ineffable odour, pervading the atmosphere around. So wonderful and mysterious an event astonished the Apostles, who could draw from it but one conclusion, that it had pleased the Word of God, that her immaculate body (by which he was incarnate) should be preserved from corruption, and should be at once translated to heaven, without waiting for the general resurrection of all flesh.'

"In the service of the next day is the following lesson:—'But who is sufficient to conceive, how glorious on this day was the progress of *the Queen of the World!*—with what transport of devout affection the whole multitude of the heavenly hosts went

forth to meet her!—with what hymns she was conducted to the throne of glory!—with how placid, how serene an aspect!—with what Divine embraces she was received by her Son, and *exalted above every creature!*—with that honour which became the worth of so great a Mother, and that glory which befitted so great a Son!'

"The title here bestowed on her, of 'Queen of the World,' is not the highest which she has received. In the Bull of Sixtus, adopted, I repeat, by the Council of Trent, she is styled 'Queen of the Heavens,' and her Son is spoken of in the same sentence as 'King.' Indeed, in one of your popular prayer-books, now in use in this country (to which, therefore, you refer us), she is thus addressed,—'O glorious Queen of Heaven!' This same title, 'Queen of Heaven,' is given to her in the *Breviary*, where she is also called *Domina omnium creaturarum*,—able, therefore, we may presume, to dispense to her worshippers any blessing they can need or ask."—P. 41, *Dr Phillpotts's Letters.* London, 1826.

II. Mary is represented as the Mother of Mercy.—Mary is represented as the mother and dispenser of *mercy*, while Jesus is regarded as the God of justice. In accordance with this, the sinner is taught to approach Mary with more confidence of acceptance than even Jesus,—

"Of how many souls would not heaven be deprived, but for Mary's intercession? 'I make lights in heaven which shall never be extinguished.' These eternal lights are the servants of Mary. 'All who trust in Mary,' says St Bonaventure, 'will see heaven's gates open to receive them after death.' *Qui speraverit in illa porta cœli reserabiter ei.* St Ephrem calls devotion to Mary, 'The key of paradise.' Let us beg of her to unlock to us the gate of this celestial abode, since she has the key—what do I say? she is, herself, the gate of heaven, since the Church styles her, *Janua Cœli.* This holy Church also styles Mary 'The Star of the sea;' for, as mariners are conducted in their course by the light of the stars, so Christians, by looking on Mary, are guided to the port of eternal salvation.

"St Peter Damian, for the same reason, calls her 'Ladder to heaven;' for as God descended from heaven by her, so man, by her means, deserves to ascend from earth to heaven. You have been filled with graces, Queen of the universe,' says St Athanasius, 'that you might become the way of our salvation, and the road by which we ascend to our celestial country.' St Bernard calls Mary a 'Vehicle to heaven;' and another saint says, 'Hail, noble Chariot, by which your servants are conducted to the end of their course.' 'Happy are they who know you, O Mother of God,' says St Bonaventure, 'for to know you, is the way to eternal life, and to celebrate your praises, is the high road to heaven.'

"We read in the *Chronicles of St Francis*, that Brother Leo once saw in a vision, two ladders, one red, at the summit of which was Jesus Christ; and the other white, at the top of which pre-

sided his blessed Mother. He observed, that many who endeavoured to ascend the first ladder, after mounting a few steps, fell down; and on trying again, were equally unsuccessful, so that they never attained the summit; *but a voice having told them to make trial of the white ladder, they soon gained the top, the blessed Virgin having held forth her hands to help them.*"—P. 176, *Glories of Mary.* Dub. 1841.

What a dishonour to the all-merciful Jesus, who ever liveth to make intercession for us, and who is able to save unto the uttermost, all who come unto God by Him!—who has given the blessed invitation, "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy "laden, and I will give you rest," Matt. xi. 28.

III. The Psalter of the Virgin.—Mary is called the *Queen of Heaven*, and praises which belong only to the Divine Being, are ascribed to her. *Saint* Bonaventure, called the seraphic doctor, published a *Psalter of the Virgin*, which was, in part, the Psalms of David, with the name of Mary substituted for that of God. The author of these pages has before him an edition of this *Psalter*, published in Rome in the year 1834, with the *imprimatur* of the Papal authorities. The following are specimens of the work:—

"Psalm 1.

"Blessed is the man that loveth thy name, Virgin Mary: thy grace shall strengthen his heart.

"As a fertile spot moistened by the water streams: thou shalt plant in him the fruit of righteousness.

"Blessed art thou among women: for the believing disposition of thy sacred heart.

"For in the beauty of thy person thou surpassest all women: thou excellest Angels and Archangels in the advancement of holiness.

"Thy mercy and grace are everywhere told forth: and God hath blessed the operations of thy hands. Glory, &c."

"Psalm 2.

"Why do our enemies rage: and imagine vain things against us?

"Let thy right hand protect us, Mother of God: as a terrible sword confounding and destroying them.

"*Come unto her, all ye that labour and are heavy laden: and she will give rest unto your souls.*

"Come to her in your temptations: and the benignity of her countenance shall establish you.

"Bless her with all your heart: for the earth is full of her mercy. Glory, &c."

"PSALM 3.

"Lady, how are they increased that trouble me: in thy wrath shalt thou persecute and scatter them.

"Loosen the bonds of our iniquity: remove the burden of our sins.

"Have mercy upon me, O Lady, and heal my infirmity: take away the pain and anguish of my heart.

"Deliver me not over unto my enemies: but support my soul in the day of my death.

"Conduct me to the gate of salvation: and restore my breath to him who hath created and made me. Glory be, &c."

"PSALM 24.

"Unto thee, O Lady, will I lift up my soul: in the judgment of God, through thy prayer I shall not be afraid.

"And let not my enemies triumph over me: for all they that hope in thee are strengthened.

"Let not the snares of death prevail against me: and let not the camp of the ungodly impede my paths.

"Crush their attack through thy power: and with mildness meet my soul.

"Be thou my leader to my country; and vouchsafe to add me to the company of the Angels. Glory, &c."

"PSALM 148.

"O praise our Lady of heaven: praise her in the height.

"Praise her, all ye men and beasts: fowls of the heaven and the fishes of the sea.

"Praise her, Sun and Moon: stars and orbits of the planets.

"Praise her, Cherubim and Seraphim: Thrones and Dominions and Powers.

"Praise her, all ye legions of Angels: praise her, all ye orders of spirits above. Glory, &c"*

---

* The following extracts will serve as farther specimens:—

"We praise thee, O Mother of God: we acknowledge thee, Virgin Mary."

"All the earth doth worship thee: the Spouse of the Everlasting Father."

"*Holy, holy, holy*, Mary, Mother of God; Mother and Virgin. The Church throughout all the world joins in calling upon thee."

"The Mother of a Divine Majesty."—*Hymn similar to that ascribed to Ambrose and Augustine*, vv. 1, 2, 7, 14.

"Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary, that he hold the right faith about Mary."—*Creed like that of Athanasius*, v. 1.

"After all that has been said, we are to consider that Mary is interpreted Lady; this title, also, excellently suits so great an *Empress*, who is, in truth, *Ruler of things in Heaven, in Earth, and under the Earth; Ruler, I say, of Angels, Ruler of Men, Ruler of Demons, Ruler of each in Heaven, Ruler in the World, Ruler in Hell.*"—Extract from the *Speculum B. V. M., or Virgin's Looking-Glass.*

IV. Sodalities of the Virgin.—Sodalities and societies are established in honour of the Virgin; and so great is the spiritual dependence which is placed on her, that it extends even to senseless objects—scapulars, medals, &c. The Sodality of the Scapular, the Sacred Heart, the Immaculate Conception, and other societies, are instituted in honour of the Virgin. Of the scapular, we give a brief outline, taken from the *History of the Scapular*, published in Dublin, in 1845:—

"In the year 1245, St Simon Stock was chosen general of the order of the Blessed Virgin Mary of Mount Carmel. This holy man was born in the county of Kent, in the year 1163; when he was twelve years of age, he withdrew himself into a wood, where he lived for the space of twenty years in great austerity, and in the perpetual exercise of celestial meditations, having for his house the trunk of a hollow oak, from whence he was named Stock, and had for his food, roots, herbs, and sometimes bread, which a dog brought him in his mouth, especially on festival days."—P. 26.

"As he was upon his knees in the oratory, the most glorious Virgin, environed with celestial splendour in the company of many thousands of angels, appeared to him, and holding the sacred Scapular in her hand, she said to him these words: *Receive, most beloved Son, the Scapular of thy Order, a sign of my confraternity, a privilege both to thee and to all Carmelites, in which he that dieth shall not suffer eternal fire; behold the sign of salvation, a safeguard in danger, the covenant of peace, and everlasting alliance!*"—P. 28.

"*Instructions how the Scapular is to be received and worn, and what is required to gain the privilege annexed to it.*

"The Scapular must be made of cloth, serge, or other stuff, and not of silk, though it may be lined with silk, or embroidered with gold or silver; it must be of a brown or tawny colour; the reason of this is, because it is worn in honour of the most blessed Virgin Mary, of whom it is attested by Baronius, tom. 1, annal Carthagenia, tom. 2. homin. 4. and by others, *that she never wore silk but woollen, and that of the native colour*—so Epiphanius, lib. 2. cap. 23, saith, the clothes she (the blessed Virgin) wore, were of the native colour, which doth appear by the veil of her head; in this, therefore, it is meet, that the devoted children of the blessed Virgin Mary should imitate their good mother.

"We said even now, that when any one enters first into the confraternity, it is necessary that the Scapular should be blessed; but if that comes to be lost or worn out, another may be taken, which need not be blessed.

"The Scapular is to be worn continually day and night, and never to be taken off till death; also, it is good to be buried with it. The brothers and sisters may wear it about their necks, not

in their pockets, or in their girdle, nor folded in their breasts, for it being a Scapular, must be worn in the form of a Scapular,—that is to say, a vest, or habit, that hangs over the shoulders."—P. 53.

"*Virtues of the Scapular.*

"Wherefore, I will conclude with what is related 4 Kings v. 13. Naaman, the Syrian, who was infected with leprosy, was told by Eliseus the prophet, Go and wash in the Jordan seven times, and thou shalt be clean; but he contemning to follow this advice, as a thing that would not at all avail him, was emphatically exhorted thereto by his servant, in this manner: If the prophet had bid thee some great thing, thou oughtest to have done it; how much rather, then, when he said to thee, Wash and be clean—I say the same at present, concerning the sacred habit of the Scapular. If our blessed Lady had bid us do some great act, we ought to do it; how much rather, then, when she saith, Wear my livery, and you shall not suffer eternal fire! If she had enjoined us to make great abstinence, to undergo some rigorous mortification, or to undertake a long and tedious pilgrimage, with this condition, that we should be freed from eternal damnation, from the torments of Purgatory, and from the many dangerous events which easily do befall us in this life, right reason would dictate to us, that we ought to attempt anything for the obtaining of so great a good; how much more, then, when she hath annexed these and many more extraordinary graces, to the reception only, and devout wearing the holy habit of the Scapular, with a final confidence in her holy protection? But you will, perhaps, with Naaman object, What does such a weak thing avail us, as the Scapular is? To this I answer with the Apostles (1 Cor. i. 27), The weak things of the world hath God chosen, that he might confound the strong. He that made choice of this weak element of water to wash us from original sin, which is so deeply indicated in us by the prevarication of our first father, Adam, hath made use of the weak habit of the Scapular to produce those excellent effects which are mentioned in the chapter following."

"*A Relation of Miracles, &c.*

"The last privilege of those that are enrolled in the confraternity of the sacred Scapular, is contained in these words of our blessed Lady to St Simon Stock:—*Ecce signum salutis salus in periculis:* and it is a perpetual safeguard from all manner of perils, as well by sea as by land; a protection and defence against fire, thunder, and lightning; many tempests have been appeased by the Scapular; many fires have been quenched; many sorts of infirmities have been cured; grievous contagions have been overcome; the devils have been put to flight; and it is the most speedy and efficacious remedy against witchcraft, fascinations, and enchantments that can be found. All this may be manifested by several examples."—P. 63. Dublin, 1845.

The Doctrine of the Immaculate Conception.

In December 1854, the Pope published a bull declaring that the Virgin Mary had been born without sin,

and thereby added a new article to the Creed. This is one of the most daring and palpable innovations of that Church; for the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception is in opposition to the testimony of the Fathers of the Christian Church, of doctors, saints, and even popes of the Church of Rome.

Fathers against the Immaculate Conception.

Cardinal Cajetan, who is well known as a staunch supporter of the Papacy, wrote a treatise on the subject of the Immaculate Conception, in which he argues that the doctrine that the Virgin was conceived in sin is the most probable, since it has been taught by so many Fathers. He quotes Augustine, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Eusebius, Anselm, and many others, in support of his statement. The following are examples :—

Augustine says,—

"He *alone* being made man, but remaining God, never had any sin, nor did he take on him a flesh of sin, *though from the flesh of sin of his mother.* For what of flesh he thence took, he either, when taken, immediately purified, or purified in the act of taking it."—P. 61, tom. x. Benedict Ed. Paris, 1630.

Again he says,—

"Mary, springing from Adam, died because of sin; and the flesh of our Lord, derived from Mary, died to take away sin."—P. 1334, tom. x. *ut supra.*

Ambrose says,—

"Of all that are born of woman, the holy Lord Jesus was *the only one* who experienced not the contagion of earthly corruption, by reason of the novelty of his immaculate birth."—P. 1300, tom. i Bened. Ed. Paris, 1686.

Antoninus, Archbishop of Florence, in the 15th century, who was afterwards *canonized*, collected authorities on the subject, and says,—

"If the Scriptures be duly considered, and the sayings of the doctors, ancient and modern, who have been most devoted to the glorious Virgin, it is plain from their words that she was conceived in sin."—Part i. chap. ii. Lugd., 1542.

Romish Doctors against the Immaculate Conception.

Melchior Canus, an eminent doctor in the Church of Rome, says,—

"The dogma which holds that the blessed Virgin was free from original sin is nowhere delivered in the Scriptures, according to their proper sense; nay, the general law which is delivered in them embraces all who were descended from Adam, without any exception. Nor can it be said that this doctrine has descended in the church by Apostolic tradition; for traditions of this kind cannot have come to us through any other persons than by the ancient bishops, and the holy authors who succeeded the Apostles. But it is evident that the ancient writers did not receive this doctrine from their predecessors."—P. 337, vol. i. *De locis Theol.* Matriti, 1792.

Cardinal Cajetan having referred to the views of the fathers already quoted, says, in reference to the doctors of the Church,—

"Besides these holy fathers, a great multitude of ancient doctors agree in saying that the blessed Virgin individually was conceived in original sin, whose words any one may find either in their original works, or in the works compiled on the subject of the Conception of the blessed Virgin, by Cardinal de Turre Cremata and Vincentius de Castro Novo."—P. 204, *ut supra.*

Saints against the Immaculate Conception.

We have already quoted Augustine, Ambrose, and Antoninus, all of them canonized saints; we would now refer to Catharine of Sienna, who is stated in the Breviary to have been favoured with a vision of Christ, and to have retained ever after the sacred stigmata on her body. Even she says,—

"He (Christ) clothed himself with the taint of our nature, without taint of original sin; because this conception was not by the operation of man, but by the operation of the Holy Spirit, which was not so in Mary, because she proceeded from the seed of Adam, not by the operation of the Holy Spirit, but of man."—P. 236, Oration xiv. Venice, 1548.

Thomas Aquinas, a canonized saint, called the Angelic Doctor, says,—

"So even if the parents of the blessed Virgin were cleansed from original sin, nevertheless the blessed Virgin contracted original sin."—P. 144, Quest. xxvii. Art. 2, 60. *Tert. Par. Sum. Sac. Theol.* Lug. 1558.

Popes against the Immaculate Conception.

Gregory the Great says,—

"For he (Christ) *alone* was truly born holy."—P. 598, tom. i. Bened. Ed. Paris, 1705

Innocent III. says,—

"Eve was produced without sin, but she brought forth in sin; *Mary was produced in sin*, but she brought forth without sin."—Sermo. II. *De festo Assum Mariæ.* Colon., 1552.

The Pope now accepts the Doctrine.

Thus the Fathers of the Christian Church, and many of the most eminent doctors and saints of the Church of Rome, were opposed to the notion of the Immaculate Conception; and yet, the doctrine having grown into favour in the Romish Church, Pius IX. published a bull in December 1854, solemnly declaring that the Virgin had been born without sin:—

"Wherefore, after we had unceasingly, in humility and fasting, offered our own prayers and the public prayers of the Church to God the Father through His Son, that He would deign to direct and conform our mind by the power of the Holy Ghost, and having implored the aid of the entire heavenly host, and invoked the Paraclete with sighs, and He thus inspiring to the honour of the holy and undivided Trinity, to the glory and ornament of the Virgin mother of God, to the exaltation of the Catholic faith and the increase of the Catholic religion, by the authority of Jesus Christ our Lord, of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, We declare, pronounce, and define, that the doctrine which holds that the blessed Virgin Mary, at the first instance of her conception, by a singular privilege and grace of the omnipotent God, in virtue of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of mankind, was preserved immaculate from all stain of original sin, has been revealed by God, and therefore should firmly and constantly be believed by all the faithful. Wherefore, if any shall dare—which God avert—to think otherwise than as it has been defined by us, they should know and understand that they are condemned by their own judgment, that they have suffered shipwreck of the faith, and have revolted from the unity of the Church; and besides, by their own act, they subject themselves to the penalties justly established if what they think they should dare to signify by word, writing, or any outward means."—Excerpted from *The Tablet* of 27th Jan. 1855.

A new article is hereby added to the faith. A few years ago, Milner, in his "End of Controversy," said,—

"The Church sees *nothing* absolutely clear and certain concerning it, either in the written or unwritten word, and, therefore leaves her children to form their own opinions concerning it."—Part i. Letter 12.

What Rome could not see for eighteen hundred years, she now sees, and therein contradicts the express teaching of Scripture.

Scripture against the Immaculate Conception.

St Paul says,—

Rom. 3. 23. For *all* have sinned and come short of the glory of God.

Rom. 5. 12. Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon *all men, for that all have sinned.*

Gal. 3. 22. But the scripture hath concluded *all* under sin.

Moreover, the Church of Rome is placed in a dilemma. Councils are either necessary, or not necessary. If they are necessary in decrees of faith, the bull of the Pope, setting up the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception without a General Council, is invalid. If they are not necessary, either the Pope must be regarded as infallible, or the Protestant doctrine, in reference thereto, must be accepted.

Religious Worship given to Saints.

"The Litany and Prayers recommended to be said in Catholic Families every evening.

"Lord, have mercy on us. Christ, have mercy on us.
"Christ, hear us. Christ, graciously hear us.
"God, the Father of heaven, *Have mercy on us.*
"God, the Son, Redeemer of the world, *Have mercy on us.*
"Holy Trinity, one God, *Have, &c.*
"God, the Holy Ghost, *Have, &c.*

Holy Mary,
Holy Mother of God,
Holy Virgin of Virgins,
St. Michael,
St. Gabriel,
St. Raphael,
All ye holy angels and archangels,
All ye holy orders of blessed spirits,
St. John Baptist,
St. Joseph,
All ye holy patriarchs and prophets,
St. Peter,
St. Paul,
St. Andrew,
St. James,
St. John,
St. Thomas,
St. James,
St. Philip,
St. Bartholomew,
St. Matthew,
St. Simon,
St. Thaddeus,
St. Matthias,
St. Barnaby,
St. Luke,
St. Mark,
All ye holy apostles and evangelists,
All ye holy disciples of our Lord,
All ye holy innocents,
St. Stephen,
St. Laurence,
St Vincent,
SS. Fabian and Sebastian,
SS. John and Paul,
SS. Cosmas and Damian.
SS. Jervase and Protase,

} Pray for us.

All ye holy martyrs,
St. Silvester,
St. Gregory,
St. Ambrose,
St. Augustine,
St. Jerom,
St. Martin,
St. Nicholas,
All ye holy bishops and confessors,
All ye holy doctors,
St. Anthony,
St. Bennet,
St. Bernard,
St. Dominick,
St. Francis,
All ye holy priests and levites,
All ye holy monks and hermits,
St. Mary Magdalen,
St. Agatha,
St. Lucy,
St. Agnes,
St. Cecily,
St. Catherine,
St. Anastasia,
} Pray for us.

" All ye holy virgins and widows, *Pray for us.*
" All ye men and women, saints of God, *Make intercession for us.*"

Religious Worship through the Merits of Saints.

Romanists, moreover, pray to God through the *merits* of Saints. We give a few examples. We might give many :—

" 6*th December.*—6. *St Nicholas.*

" *Collect. Deus, qui.*—O God, who, by innumerable miracles, hast honoured blessed Nicholas the Bishop, grant, we beseech thee, that by his *merits* and intercession, we may be delivered from eternal flames. Through the Lord.

" 29*th of January.*—29. *St Francis de Sales.*

" *Collect.*—O God, who, *for the salvation of souls*, wast pleased that blessed Francis, thy confessor and bishop, should become *all to all*, mercifully grant, that being plentifully enriched with the sweetness of thy charity, by following his directions, and by *the help of his merits*, we may obtain life everlasting. Through the Lord.

" *On the* 18*th of May.—On the Feast of St Venantius the Martyr.*

" O God, who hast consecrated this day to the triumph of the blessed Venantius thy martyr, hear the prayers of thy people, and grant that we, who venerate his *merits*, may imitate the constancy of his faith. Through the Lord.

" Grant, O Almighty God, that *the merits* of blessed Venantius may render *this oblation* acceptable to thee ; that we, being assisted by his prayers, may become partakers of his glory. Through the Lord.

" Having received, O Lord, the sacrament of eternal life, we humbly beseech thee, that *by the intercession* of blessed Venantius thy martyr, it may procure for us pardon and grace. Through the Lord."—*Missale Romanum. Dublinii, typis Patritii Cogan, cum superiorum permissu et approbatione*, 1795.

Thus, the kneeling, bowing, prostration, and praises

of the Church of Rome, offered to Mary and the Saints, being connected with a sense of sin, of spiritual dependence, and thanksgiving for mercy received, is idolatry.

Questions and Answers.

1. *Q.*—What varieties of worship does the Church of Rome declare?

A.—Three:—*dulia*, to the saints; *hyperdulia*, to the Virgin; and *latria*, to God.

2. *Q.*—Are these distinctions scriptural?

A.—No; they are anti-scriptural, and useless in practice.

3. *Q.*—How are they anti-scriptural?

A.—Because *dulia* represents the service of God, Matt. vi. 24.

4. *Q.*—How are they useless in practice?

A.—Because no one could so nicely balance his feelings, as to give to God, the Virgin, and the saints, their exact portion.

5. *Q.*—What does the Church of Rome teach as to Mary?

A.—That *mercy* is assigned to her, and justice to Jesus; and therefore, practically, her members are taught to fly to Mary, with more confidence than even to Jesus.

6. *Q.*—Has the Church instituted festivals in honour of Mary?

A.—Yes, as many as in honour of Christ; and she teaches, that her body was taken up to heaven, which has led to the festival of the Assumption.

7. *Q.*—What is the *Psalter of the Virgin;* and by whom written?

A.—It is, in fact, a portion of the Psalms of David, accommodated to the worship of the Virgin. The author is called by Romanists *Saint* Bonaventure.

8. *Q.*—When was the Scapular, or "Livery of the "Virgin," said to be given; and what are its virtues?

A.—It was said to be given in the year 1215, to St Simon Stock. It is made of brown stuff; and when

worn devoutly, it is miraculous in its character, and a safeguard against the devil and Purgatory.

9. *Q.*—To what authorities is Rome opposed in the decree of the Immaculate Conception?

A.—To the opinions of the Fathers, and to her own doctors, popes, and saints.

10. *Q.*—To what is she more especially opposed in this matter?

A.—To the word of God.

11. *Q.*—Do Romanists pray to saints?

A.—Yes; and they pray to God through their *merits*.

CHAPTER XVIII.

Invocation of Saints Contrary to Scripture.

(PART SECOND.)

SEVENTH ARTICLE OF THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV.

"Likewise, that the saints reigning together with Christ, are to be honoured and invocated, and that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to be held in veneration."—*Extracted from the* "Ordo Administrandi Sacramenti," p. 67. London, 1840.

SOME passages of Scripture are quoted by Romanists in favour of prayer to dead saints. We refer to them in the order in which they occur in the *Grounds of Catholic Doctrine*. Let us simply premise, that even if it could be proved that saints and angels pray *for* us, it would by no means follow, that we are therefore bound to pray *to* them. Christians in distant lands pray for us to one common Father; we should not, therefore, think of praying *to* them,—for as they are finite, they could not hear our prayers.

Romish Arguments for Saint-Worship.

1. They quote Zechariah i. 12, where "The Angel of "the Lord" intercedes for Jerusalem.

We answer, (1.) That, on Romish interpretation, this text does not authorise us to pray *to* angels. (2.) That

"the Angel of the Lord," in said text, is the blessed Jesus;—of which we have examples in Malachi iii. 1, where Jesus is described as "the Messenger of the Cove-"nant"—or, as it should be translated, "the Angel of "the Covenant;" and also in Acts vii. 30–32, where it is written, "that an angel of the Lord in a flame of fire "in a bush," appeared to Moses, saying, "*I am the God* "of thy fathers;"—thus showing, that "the Angel of "the Lord" who intercedes for Jerusalem, is the Lord Jesus.

Cyril of Alexandria says:—

"And no less does the blessed Zacharias speak to us in words of equal import; for he says, 'And the angel answered speaking in me.' For it was customary to the holy prophets *to call the word of God an angel*, as being one who announced things to them, and who clearly set forth the will of God the Father."—P. 10, tom. iii. *Comment. in Osiam.* Lutet. 1138.

2. Romanists refer to Rev. v. 8, where the elders are represented as having golden vials "full of odours, "which are the prayers of saints." The four-and-twenty elders, however, represent the Church on earth; and the prayers which they offer, are their *own* prayers. If the Romish interpretation be true (by the by, the Church of Rome has given no authorised sense at all), the prayers of the saints are offered by *the elders;* whereas Romanists, reversing matters, are of opinion, that the prayers of the faithful are offered *by the saints* (the canonized), or rather, that the faithful pray to the saints to pray for them.*

* It is evident,—1. That the four-and-twenty elders represent the Church; for they sung a new song, saying, "Thou art worthy to take the book, and open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, *out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation,*" 9th v. This could only refer to four-and-twenty individuals, *as the representatives* of a great body.

2. It is evident, that the passage relates to the Church on earth; for the 6th chapter, which continues the subject, contains the opening of the seals, which, though it is represented as taking place in heaven, *refers to circumstances on earth.* The events symbolised by death on the pale horse, &c., &c., took place, not in heaven, but on earth. The 4th, 5th, and 6th chapters must be regarded as a whole, and are acknowledged to refer to the Church Militant.

3. They refer to Hebrews xii. 22, where it is said, that believers "are come unto Mount Sion, ... and "to an innumerable company of angels." Surely the advocates of Romanism are in great need of texts when they quote this, which says not one word of intercession by saints or angels, but points out, by anticipation, the future glory of God's people.

4. They quote Luke xvi. 27, 28, or the example of the rich man who, *in Hell*, prayed to Abraham; but the conduct of a *lost* soul, is no safe guide to the Christian. Besides, the prayer was ineffectual. There is not one instance in the Bible of a *living* saint praying to a *dead* saint for his intercession!

5. They refer to Rev. vi. 10, where the souls of the martyrs are represented as saying, "How long, O Lord, "holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our "blood on them that dwell on the earth?" This is similar to the declaration, "The *voice* of thy brother's "*blood crieth* unto me from the ground," Gen. iv. 10. The book of Revelation is acknowledged to be, for the most part, figurative and symbolical. This text by no means warrants sinners on earth praying to the redeemed in heaven.

6. They refer to Luke xvi. 9, "Make to yourselves "friends of the mammon of iniquity, that, when ye fail, "they may receive you into everlasting habitations." (1.) Christ does not say, Make to yourselves friends of the saints. Surely they are not the "mammon of iniquity." (2.) The passage refers to good works, which will be the *evidence* for the Christian of his acceptance with Christ.

7. They refer to various passages in which the duty of intercessory prayer is taught; but these passages do not prove that a *living* saint may pray to a *dead* saint to pray for him. Christians, while on earth, should intercede for each other; but in "the holy of holies"—heaven above—none can intercede but Christ. This we shall prove more fully by and by.

8. They refer to Luke xv. 10, "Likewise, I say unto

"you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God, "over one sinner that repenteth," and 1 Cor. iv. 9, "For I think that God hath set forth us the apostles "last, as it were appointed to death: for we are made a "spectacle unto the world, and to angels, and to men," to prove that the saints know what takes place on earth. The former passage proves the reverse, for it shows that the saints knew nothing of the sinner's conversion until Christ the good Shepherd had told them. The latter proves nothing as to the *omniscience* of angels. The Apostles were a spectacle to *men* and angels, and consequently men were as gifted in this respect as angels. But men, we know, are not omniscient; and, by a parity of reasoning, neither are angels. Who would ever contend, that Paul in Britain, could hear a prayer offered up by Barnabas in the east?

Arguments against Saint-Worship.

We reject prayer to saints,—

I. We cannot infallibly know who are Saints. —Because we cannot infallibly know who are really saints. It appears from the works of Cardinal Bellarmine, that a *drunkard* was worshipped as a saint in the time of Pope Alexander III., who at length corrected the mistake.* The same Cardinal informs us, that the departed spirit of a man who was adored as a saint, appeared to *St Martin*, and acknowledged that he was "a *damned spirit*."

The Church of Rome, as a safeguard against such imposition, has introduced the system of canonization. The alleged miracles of the deceased are examined, and a person who is styled "the devil's advocate" is employed to urge objections. The decree of the Pope is then issued, and, with many ceremonials, the dead man is enrolled amongst the saints; but the question then arises, Is such canonization *infallible?* With no degree of consistency, until 1870, could even the Romanists assert that it is. They could not say where infallibility is

* *De Cult Sanct.*, l. i. c. 7.

lodged,—whether in the Church diffusive, in Councils, in the Pope, or in Councils with the Pope at their head. It is absurd to suppose that a Church possessing infallibility was at sea on this practical point for eighteen hundred years after Christ!

Those only, therefore, who held that the Pope, without a Council, was infallible, could, with any consistency, believe that his act in canonization is infallible. The French and English divines, and many other Romish theologians, denied the infallibility of the Pope. And even as it is, the *extent* of the Pope's infallibility has not been defined. The definition of 1870 declares that the Pope is infallible when he speaks *ex cathedra, de fide et moribus*,—on subjects of faith and morals. But it is a question whether the saintship of any individual comes under this head. God only knows the heart, and He alone knoweth who are His (2 Chron. vi. 30).

The saints are canonized on account of alleged miracles. The following instances will serve as a specimen:—Five saints were added to the Calendar in 1839, and amongst them St Joseph of the Cross, and St Alphonsus Liguori.

Of St Alphonsus it is recorded,—

"Magdalen de Nunzio, of Raino, near Benevento, suffered in 1790 from an abscess in the left breast. A surgeon made an incision to let off the ulcerous matter, lest a gangrene should ensue. A considerable quantity of it ran off, but the gangrene, which had been already formed, continued to eat away the flesh around the seat of the disorder, so that the wound became still deeper, and it became necessary to cut away the greater part of the breast. But as she grew rapidly worse, the surgeon ordered the rites of the Church to be administered. In the evening of that day, one of her neighbours, coming to see her, brought with her a picture of the Saint, with a small piece of his garment. By her advice, *the sick woman recommended herself to Alphonsus, and placed the picture upon the wound, and swallowed a few threads of the relic in some water* She then fell into a quiet sleep, and when she arose in the morning, discovered, to her great surprise, *that she was perfectly cured, and the whole of her breast restored, even that part which had been cut off*, nor did she ever afterwards suffer any pain or inconvenience from it."—*Calendar*, p. 94.

Of St Joseph it is said,—

"A part of the Convent of St Lucy of the Mount, called the noviciate, was nightly infested by wicked spirits, but our Saint, by blessing the apartment, effectually dislodged them. Strange

to say, after his death they attempted to return, but were driven away by the invocation of his name. Even the elements obeyed him. Rain ceased at his command, when it was falling heavily so as to threaten to oblige him to seek shelter. Another time, journeying with a companion under an incessant shower, when they had reached their destination their garments were dry, as though they had walked under the sun all the way. All nature was obedient and subservient to him. The air bore to him on its wings his stick, which he had left behind; and the herbs, as we have seen, grew supernaturally to minister to his charity. Sometimes he wrought his miracles by simple prayer, frequently by making the sign of the cross, by the application of sacred relics, or images, or of the oil burning before them."—*Calendar*, p. 102.

II. The Saints cannot hear Prayer.—We have reason to believe, that the saints cannot hear our prayers. 2 Kings xxii. 20, and Isaiah lxiii. 16, prove that Josiah, Abraham, and Israel, after death, were not cognizant of affairs in this world:—

2 Kings 22. 20. Behold, therefore, I will gather thee unto thy fathers, and thou shalt be gathered into thy grave in peace; and thine eyes shall not see all the evil which I will bring upon this place. And they brought the king word again.

Isaiah 63. 16. Doubtless thou art our Father, though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not: thou, O Lord, art our Father, our Redeemer, thy name is from everlasting.

The Romanist himself cannot tell how the saints hear prayers offered up to them. Bellarmine says, that doctors entertain *four* different opinions upon the subject,—1. Some assert that the saints acquire their knowledge from the angels; but this only removes the difficulty one step, for the question still remains, How do the angels acquire *theirs?* 2. Others say, that the saints possess a wonderful celerity in locomotion; but this very assertion proves, that they are not everywhere, *at the same instant*, and so cannot know all things, every mental and uttered prayer. *And where is the evidence of such locomotion?* 3. Some say that the saints see all things in God; but is there a shadow of authority for this? If they see all things in God, they are *omniscient*. 4. Others think that the prayers offered up are revealed to them by God. Thus Jehovah communicates to the saint, the prayer of one on earth, that the saint would intercede with *God* for him. Is there any Bible warrant

for—nay, any sense in such a solution? Is it not derogatory to the divine glory? Why does not an infallible Church step in amidst these opposing doctors, and declare which is right,—if any?

III. No Prayer to Saints in Scripture.—There is not one instance upon record in the sacred Scriptures, of prayer offered by a living to a dead saint. The Invocation of Saints, and more especially the worship of the Virgin, is a prominent feature of Romanism. But it has no existence in the divine records of primitive Christianity. At every step, as we move amid the worship of the Romish Church, we meet festivals of the saints, and prayers to them. Mary is held forth as the Queen of the Universe, as "our life, our sweetness, and "our hope;" but, strange to say, the Bible nowhere contains such titles. There is not a word of the assumption of Mary into heaven. She is nowhere spoken of as the object of hope; and, indeed, she is not spoken of in the Acts and the Epistles at all, save once in the former, where she is designated simply as "Mary, the mother "of Jesus," Acts i. 14, and in the latter, as "a woman:"—

Gal. 4. 4. Made of a *woman*, made under the law.

Is it conceivable, that the Virgin and Saints could have occupied the same position in the primitive Church, as in modern Rome, and yet the Bible nowhere records even one prayer to a saint, or expresses one hope as founded upon such prayers and saintly intercession?

IV. Scripture forbids Saint-Worship.—The Scriptures repudiate all saint-worship:—

1. Acts 10. 25. And as Peter was coming in, Cornelius met him, and fell down at his feet, and worshipped him. V 26. But Peter took him up, saying, Stand up; I myself also am a man.

2. Acts 14. 14. Which when the apostles, Barnabas and Paul, heard of, they rent their clothes, and ran in among the people, crying out, V 15. And saying, Sirs, why do ye these things? We also are men of like passions with you, and preach unto you, that ye should turn from these vanities unto the living God, which made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all things that are therein.

3. Col. 2. 18. Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into

those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind.

4. Rev. 19. 10. And I fell at his feet to worship him. And he said unto me, See thou do it not; I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren that have the testimony of Jesus: worship God: for the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy.

Rev. 22. 8. And I John saw these things, and heard them. And when I had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the feet of the angel which showed me these things. V 9. Then saith he unto me, See thou do it not: for I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book: worship God.

Peter, and Paul, and Barnabas, rejected with horror religious worship when offered to them; and when John fell at the feet of the angel, he was rebuked by him, who said, "See thou do it not, I am thy fellow-servant; "*worship God.*" And here we are reminded of an act of wilful dishonesty on the part of a Romish priest. Father Keenan, in his *Controversial Catechism*, p. 136, asks the question, "*Should we honour the Saints and "Angels?*" and, replying in the affirmative, he says,—

"St John fell down to adore before the feet of the angel;"

—and he refers to Rev. xxii. 8. *He, however, leaves out the 9th verse, where such adoration is condemned!* What wilful dishonesty and daring misquotation, even in Scotland, in 1851!

The Apostle distinctly forbids the worship of angels in Coloss. ii. 18.

The angel refused the worship of John.

V. Christ the only Mediator.—Christ is set forth in Scripture as the alone Saviour, Mediator, and way to God:—

John 3. 36. He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.

John 10. 9. I am the *door:* by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out, and find pasture.

John 14. 6. Jesus saith unto him, I am *the way*, and the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, *but by me.* V 13. And whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son.

Acts 4. 12. Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved.

Rom. 8. 34. Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that

died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh *intercession* for us.

Ephes. 2. 18. For *through him* we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father.

1 Tim. 2. 5. For there is one God, and *one* mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; V 6. Who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time.

Heb. 7. 24. But this man, because he continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood. V 25. Wherefore he is able also to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing *he ever liveth to make intercession for them.*

1 Peter 2. 5. Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God *by Jesus Christ.*

1 John 2. 1. My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: V 2. And he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.

VI. Invocation of Saints antichristian. — The invocation of saints arises from the spirit of antichrist, foretold in the Word of God:—

1 John 4. 1. Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world. V 2. Hereby know ye the Spirit of God; Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: V 3. And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world.

This prophecy received its primary fulfilment in the Apostle's day, "And even *now already* is it in the world." Certain heretics maintained, that Christ had only the *appearance* of a human body. They were called *Docetæ*. They acknowledged the deity, but denied the *humanity* of Christ. There are "*many* antichrists," 1 John ii. 18; but all the spirits of antichrist seem to have combined in the Church of Rome, which is the great antichrist. That Church professedly admits, but *practically* denies, the *humanity* of our Lord. She teaches, as we have seen in the preceding chapter, that Mary is more merciful, more compassionate, and more willing to receive sinners, than Christ. She regards Christ (we speak of her system practically) as *God* and *Judge* of mankind, and forgets His infinite tenderness, compassion, and love. The

Apostle dwells upon the fact, that Christ possesses all the sympathies and tenderness of human nature to an infinite degree. He says,—

Heb. 2. 16. For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham. V 17. Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. V 18. For in that he himself hath suffered, being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted.

Heb. 4. 14. Seeing then that we have a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession. V 15. For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. V 16. Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need.

Forgetful of this blessed truth, that Christ is "bone "of our bone, and flesh of our flesh," the Romanist flies to Mary and the saints, to mediate for him; and thus the whole system of saint-worship proceeds from a practical denial that Christ is come in the flesh. Jesus is mercy, compassion, and love, to an *infinite* degree; and He says,—

Matt. 11. 28. Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.

VII. Christ alone mediates in Heaven.—The Apostle, in the 9th chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, shows that the two tabernacles—the first, where all the priests officiated, and the second, or Holy of Holies, into which alone the high priest entered—were typical in their character.

Heb. 9. 1. Then verily the first covenant had also ordinances of divine service, and a worldly sanctuary. V 2. For there was a tabernacle made; the first, wherein was the candlestick, and the table, and the shew-bread; which is called the Sanctuary. V 3. And after the second vail, the tabernacle which is called the Holiest of all; V 6. Now when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God: V 7. But into the second went the high priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people: V 8. The Holy Ghost this signifying, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing: V 9. Which was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did

the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience; V 24. For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us.

The first tabernacle, in which all the priests officiated, typified this world, where all God's people, who are "a "holy priesthood," may intercede for each other; but "the holy place" typified heaven, where none could presume to sprinkle "the flaming throne with the aton- "ing blood," or mediate, but the Apostle and High Priest of our profession—the Lord Jesus Christ. It was death for any one to interfere with the High Priest's office in the *Holy of Holies;* and none dare interfere with the mediatorial work of the blessed Jesus, who is the High Priest in heaven,—the true Holy of Holies,—and who is the "ONE MEDIATOR BETWEEN GOD "AND MEN."

Questions and Answers.

1. *Q.*—Who is the Angel of the Lord, spoken of in Zechariah i. 11, and other portions?

A.—The Lord Jesus.

2. *Q.*—Whose prayers do the elders, spoken of in Revelation v. 8, offer up?

A.—Their own.

3. *Q.*—When it is said, that believers are "come to "Mount Zion, and to the company of many thousands "of angels," to what is reference made?

A.—The future glory of the Church. Nothing is said in the text of the intercession of saints.

4. *Q.*—Does the prayer of Dives to Abraham, Luke xvi. 27, 28, authorise us to pray to saints?

A.—No; the conduct of a damned soul is no proper example for the Christian. Besides, his prayer was of no avail.

5. *Q.*—Has the exhortation, "Make to yourselves "friends of the mammon of unrighteousness," anything to do with the invocation of the saints?

A.—Nothing. What is there about the intercession

of saints in the passage? It refers to good works, which are the *evidences* of a justified state.

6. *Q.*—Do those passages which relate to intercessory prayer, prove the duty of invocating saints?

A.—No. Such passages relate to *living* saints, and not to the *dead*. Christ in heaven—the true Holy of Holies—alone intercedes.

7. *Q.*—The angels rejoice at the sinner's conversion. Does that prove that they, *of themselves*, know everything or anything that takes place on earth?

A.—No. For they do not even know of the sinner's conversion, until the good Shepherd *tells* them, by calling them together, and saying, "Rejoice with me; for "I have found my sheep which was lost," Luke xv. 6.

8. *Q.*—The Apostle says, that they (the Apostles) were a spectacle "to angels and to men," 1 Cor. iv. 9. Will that prove that the angels know all?

A.—No. No more than that *men* know all; for the apostles were a spectacle to *men* likewise.

9. *Q.*—Why do you reject prayers to saints?

A.—Because,—1. We do not infallibly know who are really saints. 2. We have reason to believe, that the saints cannot hear our prayers. 3. There is not one instance on scriptural record, of prayer to saints. 4. The Scriptures repudiate saint-worship. 5. Christ is set forth as the only Saviour. 6. Saint-worship arises from forgetfulness of the truth that Christ is come in the flesh. 7. Christ is our High Priest in heaven; and as none dare interfere with the high priest's office in the earthly "holy of holies," so none could interfere with Christ's mediation in "the courts above."

CHAPTER XIX.

Images.

(PART FIRST.)

EIGHTH ARTICLE OF THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV.

"I most firmly assert, that the images of Christ, of the Mother of God, ever virgin, and also of other saints, may be had and

retained, and that due honour and veneration are to be given them."—*Extracted from the* "Ordo Administrandi Sacramenti." p. 67. London, 1840.

THE article declares, that due honour and veneration should be rendered to Images. Similar is the statement of the Council of Trent, *Sess.* 25; but when we inquire what that honour is, we receive no definite answer from the Church of Rome; for her Councils and doctors are at variance upon the subject.

While they all agree that religious worship is due to Images (which we believe to be idolatry, by whatever name it may be called), they are at variance as to whether such worship should be *latria* (the highest kind), or honorary worship.

Before we turn to the *practice* of the Church of Rome, in order to ascertain the nature of the adoration which is rendered to the Cross, we shall briefly consider, the differences which exist within her bosom, upon the *theory* of the question.

Differences among Romanists on Image-Worship.

We shall place the views of the Second Council of Nice, and those of the *Pontifical* and St Thomas Aquinas, in parallel columns, that the differences may at once appear:—

SECOND COUNCIL OF NICE.	PONTIFICAL.
"And to give them (the images) the salutation and honorary worship, *not* indeed the true *latria*, according to our faith, which belongs to the divine nature *only*."—*Labbe's Councils.* Paris, 1672.	"The cross of the legate, because *latria is due to it*, shall be on the right hand."—*Roman Pontifical.*
AQUINAS.	
"Since, therefore, Christ is to be adored with the worship of *latria*, it follows that His *image is* to be adored with the worship of *latria*."—Quest. 25, art. 3, 3d Part, *Sum. Theol.*	

The discrepancy is at once apparent. The Second Council of Nice, while decreeing that "honorary worship" belongs to the Cross, distinctly says, that "*latria*" *is not* due to it.

On the other hand, the *Pontifical* and St Thomas

Aquinas, the Angelic Doctor, teach that *latria is* due to the Cross.

The Council of Trent takes no notice of this question, but leaves it where it had found it; and contents itself by teaching, that "*due* honour and veneration should "be rendered to Images."

Aquinas, and a host of doctors, teach that "*latria*" is the due honour to be rendered to images.

The Second Council of Nice, and a host of others, declare that "*latria*" belongs to God alone, and that "honorary worship" only is due to Images. The reasons which are alleged by opposing parties, render the difference more serious.

The Nicene advocates declare, that *latria* belongs to God alone, which amounts to a charge of idolatry against those who render that worship to an Image.

On the other hand, Aquinas and others teach, that if worship, inferior to *latria*, be rendered to images, it would appear to be given to them, without reference to God, which would be improper. If God (we give the substance of their arguments) be adored through Images, it should be with *latria*. Thus, if the decree of the Second Council of Nice be correct, *the Pontifical*, and *Saint* Thomas Aquinas, are idolatrous; while, if *Saint* Thomas be right, his opponents are involved in error. The Council of Trent, and the *Creed of Pope Pius*, in nowise define what is the honour that is due to Images.

We, as Protestants, believe, that *any* kind of religious worship,—*latria* or *dulia*, superior or inferior,—given to an Image, is idolatry.

Image-Worship as Practised by Rome.

We appeal to the *practice* of the Church of Rome, to ascertain the extent of worship which she renders to the Cross.

Adoration of the Cross.—The service for Good Friday contains the following notice:—

"Prayers being ended, the priest approaches the epistle side, his chasuble being laid aside, and there in the lower part of the

corner of the altar, receives from the deacon a cross prepared on the altar, which, turning his face to the people, he gradually uncovers from the top, beginning alone the Antiphon, *Behold the Wood of the Cross;* and then in the remainder he is assisted in singing by the ministers, until the *Venite Adoremus.* But when the chorus sings, 'Come, let us adore,' *all prostrate themselves,* except the person who performs the service. Then the priest proceeds to the front of the corner of the same epistle side, and, uncovering the right arm of the cross, and raising it a little higher than before, he begins, 'Behold *the Wood* of the Cross,' the others singing and *adoring* as above. Then he proceeds to the middle of the altar, and totally uncovering the cross and elevating it, he begins a third time more loudly, 'Behold the *Wood* of the Cross upon which the salvation of the world hangs. Come, let us adore.' Then the priest, alone, bears the cross to a place prepared for it before the altar, and kneeling, places it there. Presently putting off his shoes, he approaches to adore the cross, thrice kneeling, before he kisses it. When he has done this he returns, and receives his shoes; and afterwards the ministers of the altar, and then the other clergy, and laity, two by two, thrice kneeling, as is aforesaid, *adore the cross.*"—*Roman Missal,* Rubric for Good Friday.

From this we learn,—1. That the Cross is held up before the congregation, the priest exclaiming, "Behold "the Wood of the Cross!" and the choir chaunting, "Come, let us adore;" 2. That the clergy and laity *adore* the Cross, "*adorant crucem;*" 3. That the adoration is performed with kissing, putting off the shoes, and kneeling.

The adoration, and its extent, paid to the Cross, is at once learned from the Benediction of the Cross, the service of Good Friday, and the prayers which are offered to it.

Benediction of the Cross.—The Benediction of the Cross is performed as follows. We quote from the *Roman Pontifical:*—

"A new cross or picture of the crucifixion, is blessed in this manner. The incense and the censer, with fire and blessed water, being prepared, the Pontiff, wearing his rochet" (and other garments here mentioned), "standing without his mitre, says —

"Our help is in the name of the Lord.

"R. Who made heaven and earth.

"The Lord be with you.

"And with thy spirit.

"*Let us pray.*

"Bless, + O Lord Jesus Christ, *this thy cross* (hanc crucem tuam), through which you have delivered the world from the power of demons, and overcome, by thy passion, the suggestor of sin, who

delights in the fall of the first man, through the taking of the forbidden tree. Who, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, one God, reignest for ever. Amen."

Another prayer,—

"*Let us pray.*

"We beseech thee, O Holy Lord, Omnipotent Father, Eternal God, that thou wouldst vouchsafe to *bless* + this sign of thy cross; that *it may be a saving remedy to the human race* (ut sit remedium salutare generi humano); *that it may be the confirmation of faith —the progress of good works—the redemption of souls; that it may be a comfort, and protection, and guard against all* the darts of enemies, through our Lord Jesus Christ, thy Son, who, with thee, lives and reigns in the unity of the Holy Spirit—God."

Then, after other prayers and addresses, we find the following rubric:—

"Then incense is offered to the Pontiff in a 'Navicula,' or other vessel, which the Pontiff, standing without his mitre, blesses, saying," &c.

The benediction of the incense being completed, the Pontifical proceeds,—

"Which being done, the Pontiff places the incense in a censer. Then he sprinkles the Cross with holy water, and immediately after *incenses* it (eam incensat). Then he says, still standing without his mitre,—

"Let *this wood* be *sanctified* in the name of the Fa + ther, and of the So + n, and of the Holy + Ghost, and let *the blessing* of *that wood* on which the holy members of the Saviour were suspended, be *in this wood,* that those *praying and bowing before this Cross,* on account of God, may receive *health of body and soul,* through the same, our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

"Then the Pontiff, kneeling before the Cross, *devoutly adores and kisses it* (*ipsam devote* adorat et osculatur). The same all others who wish may do."

Benediction of Image of the Virgin.—We now pass on to the Benediction of an Image of the Virgin,—

"The Pontiff being about *to bless* an *image* of the blessed Virgin,"—

And dressed according to the directions given here says,—

"Our help is in the name of the Lord.

"R. Who made heaven and earth.

"The Lord be with you.

"And with thy spirit.

"*Let us pray.*

"O God, who from the womb of the Blessed Virgin Mary, wast willing that thy Word, according to the announcement of the angel, should take flesh, grant to thy suppliant servants that we,

truly believing her to be the Mother of God, *may be assisted with thee by her prayers.*"—*Roman Pontifical*, 3d part.

Prayers to the Cross.—The following prayers are offered to the Cross:—

"O Cross, only hope, hail
In this glory of thy triumph!
Give an increase of grace to the pious,
And blot out the crimes of the guilty."

"*On the Festival of the Exaltation of the Cross.*

"O good Cross, who hast obtained comeliness and beauty from the Lord's limbs, receive me from men, and restore me to my master."

"*On the 14th of September.*

"O Cross, more splendid than all the stars, illustrious to the world, much beloved by men, more holy than all things; who alone wert worthy to bear the treasure of the world. *Sweet wood, sweet nails*, bearing a sweet burden, *save* this present multitude assembled to-day in *thy* praise."—*Roman Breviary.*

Thus, not the burden, but that which bore the burden,—the *wood* and *nails*—are invoked, to save the multitude assembled in praise of the Cross!

Wood of the Cross Worshipped.—As a farther proof that the wood of the Cross is worshipped, we quote the following passage, from *The Life of St Mary of Egypt*:—

"Lifting up her eyes she espied, fixed upon the porch, a picture or image of the Blessed Virgin, and recollecting what she had often heard of her unspotted purity, of the powerful interest she had with her Son, and that she was the refuge of sinners, and mother of mercy, with an entire confidence in her intercession, she prostrates herself before the figure; and by a fervent prayer to this great advocate of sinners it represented, conjured her to be propitious to her in her present distress and desolation, to obtain for her the forgiveness of her sins, and, in consequence, to have this obstacle removed; the Divine permission for her to enter into the church, to see and reverence the sacred instrument of her redemption; promising, on her part, to do all that should be required of her, in order to appease and satisfy the Divine justice. Having finished her prayer, she returned, with a pious confidence of success, to the church door, and now made her way in without any resistance. An awful dread seized her, at first, upon her entrance into the sanctuary. *She, however, approached the holy wood, she reverently worshipped it*, and, at the same moment, found her soul replenished with an accustomed lightness of heart, assured trust of God's gracious pardon of her manifold sins and abominations, and an interior consolation, which she had never felt before."—P. 19. *Life of Mary of Egypt.* Dublin, 1833.

Nothing can be plainer than the declaration, "She

"approached the HOLY WOOD, she REVERENTLY "WORSHIPPED IT."

Thus, the Cross is blessed in a regular service, which is provided for its benediction, and adored with kneeling, incensing, kissing, and amid chaunts of "Come, "let us adore!" Prayers are offered to the Cross, and the multitudes invoke "the *sweet wood*, the *sweet nails*," to "save" them.

If this be not creature worship, there is no such thing as idolatry in the world.

Worship of Images Decreed by Second Council of Nice.—The Second Council of Nice, in opposition to the Council of Constantinople, passed the decree to which we have alluded, that *latria* belonged to God only. At that Council, various wonders and miracles, said to be wrought by Images, were detailed by several Fathers, to show that Images should be retained and honoured.

Swayed by these accounts, the second Council of Nice, whether with much honour to their common sense the reader will determine, passed the decree already quoted in reference to Image-worship.

Miracles Wrought by Images.—We give two instances, and reserving the further consideration of the subject, and of other arguments, for our next, we think that this miracle bears its own refutation :—

"Another man, says the same venerable authority, of the city of Citium, in the same island, being employed to hang a church with veils, in honour of the festival of the blessed Virgin's assumption, in the course of his work drove a nail into the forehead of St Peter, painted on the walls. He fastened his rope, and spread the veil; but before an hour was over, he was seized with an intolerable pain in his head, particularly in his forehead. This continued the two days of the festival, during which he lay in great torment. It happened, however, that the Bishop of Citium heard of the occurrence, and he, after giving the man a severe reprimand, directed him to go and take the nail out of the image. He did so; *and as soon as the nail was extracted, his pain ceased.*"—*Labbe's Councils*, tom. vii., p. 269.

"A lady of Rhosopolis, in Cilicia, by name Theotecna, lived with her husband twenty years, but had the misfortune to be *childless*. She was indeed, and from her earliest childhood, had been vexed with a devil. At the end of twenty years, her husband, having lost all patience at so long a disappointment of his hopes of issue, dismissed her from his house. Luckily for her, she

found a caravan just about to set off on a pilgrimage to St Symeon, and she was but happy to join the company. As soon as her devil came within sight of St Symeon, he gnashed his teeth, and was in the greatest torture, seeing the spiritual image of the saint—which thus addressed him in a human voice, 'I'll drive thee from her, thou wicked and foul fiend, and she shall go back to her husband, and have a child within a twelvemonth.' The devil bellowed in return, 'It is no business of yours. What harm have I ever done to you, that you drive me away from *my* wife? And you will give them a child too, will you? though she never had one to me!' St Symeon, after giving him a good rating, commands him to run off, like a vile slave, as he was, and draw water, and gather sticks, and be burned all the while with a burning flame. The words are no sooner out of the Saint's mouth, than the devil begins to do as he is bid; but with a very bad grace, roaring, and moaning, and jumping about, the whole time. At last, when he had finished the job the Saint had set him, in the presence of all the people, at the sight of a flash of lightning which was coming against him, he set up a fresh howl *and out he came.*

"Immediately the poor lady finds herself quite recovered, and receives from St Symeon the comfortable assurance, that her husband has had a wonderful change wrought in his heart towards her, by the Divine interposition. Accordingly, she goes to him; is received with open arms; and becomes a *joyful mother before the year is out.*"—P. 265, tom. vii. *Labbe's Councils.*

Questions and Answers.

1. *Q.*—What differences exist among Roman Catholics as to the worship of Images?

A.—Some think that they should be worshipped with the same worship which is given to Christ. Others think that they ought to receive only an inferior worship.

2. *Q.*—Do Roman Catholics adore Images?

A.—Yes. The *Roman Missal* distinctly states, that they *adore* the Cross.

3. *Q.*—Do Roman Catholics pray to Images?

A.—Yes. They entreat the "*sweet wood*, and *sweet* "*nails*," to save them.

4. *Q.*—Do they burn incense to Images?

A.—Yes. Images are regularly blessed and incensed.

5. *Q.*—Do they believe that miracles have been wrought by Images?

A.—Yes. The Second Council of Nice, on the authority of spurious miracles, or "old wives' fables," established the worship of Images.

CHAPTER XX.

Image-Worship condemned by Scripture.

(PART SECOND.)

EIGHTH ARTICLE OF THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV.

"I most firmly assert, that the images of Christ, of the Mother of God, ever virgin, and also of other saints, may be had and retained, and that due honour and veneration are to be given them."—*Extracted from the* "Ordo Administrandi Sacramenti," p. 67. London, 1840.

Romish Arguments for Image-Worship.

THE arguments professedly derived from Scripture in favour of the use and adoration of Images, are but few indeed. *The Grounds of Catholic Doctrine* gives only the following:—

"*Q.*—How do you prove that it is lawful to make or keep images of Christ and His saints?

"*A.*—Because God himself commanded Moses (Exod. xxv. 18, 19, 20, 21) to make two cherubims of beaten gold, and place them at the two ends of the mercy seat, over the ark of the covenant, in the very sanctuary. '*Thence*,' says he (verse 22), '*will I give orders, and will speak to thee over the propitiatory, and from the midst of the two cherubims which shall be upon the ark of the testimony, all things which I will command the children of Israel by thee.*' God also commanded (Num. xxi. 8, 9) a serpent of brass to be made, for the healing of those who were bit by the fiery serpents: which serpent was an emblem of Christ (John iii. 14, 15)."—P. 48. Dub. 1840.

I. In reference to the Cherubims, we reply,—

1. The Cherubims were made by the *express command* of God. If the Church of Rome can produce a command from heaven enjoining the use of Images, we shall acknowledge that she is right. Not only, however, has she no such express command, but her practice is in direct opposition to the Word of God, as we shall show.

2. The Cherubims were not adored,—this is the main point. They were not even *seen* by the people at all, but placed in the holy place, into which the high priest alone entered, and that once only in the year. If the Romanist can prove that the Jews adored the Cherubims, then will their adoration of Images and the Jewish be a

parallel. Vasques, the Jesuit, a great writer and authority in the Church of Rome, maintains that Image-worship was altogether forbidden under the Old Testament dispensation; and he contends, that the case of the Cherubims does not prove the contrary. He says,—

"So far forth, every image was forbidden as dedicated to adoration; therefore, neither the cherubims nor any other images had *any* worship in the temple."—*Disp.* 104, p. 796, tom. i. Antr. 1621.

He thinks that the second commandment was *ceremonial*, and therefore abolished at the coming of Christ,—Image-worship, according to his view, being unlawful under the Mosaic, but lawful under the Christian dispensation! Bellarmine, and hosts of others, disagree with him; and while they think that Image-worship was lawful at all times, they maintain that the second commandment was not merely ceremonial, but moral,—an instance of the unity which exists in the Church of Rome!

II. The case of the Brazen Serpent affords us a direct argument *against* Image-worship; for it is written,—

2 Kings 18. 4. He (Hezekiah) removed the high places, and brake the *images*, and cut down the groves, and *brake in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made: for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense to it:* and he called it *Nehushtan*.

Good king Hezekiah brake in pieces the brazen serpent, when the people burnt incense to it, as the Romanists do to their Images. Thus was the brazen serpent, though of sacred recollection indeed, broken into pieces when it became an object of adoration.

Admissions of Learned Romanists as to Images.

Some of the most learned Roman Catholics themselves have admitted, that the use and adoration of Images was unknown to the primitive Church.

Agobardus, Bishop of Lyons, says,—

"The orthodox Fathers, for avoiding of superstition, did carefully provide that no pictures should be set upon churches, lest that which is worshipped should be painted on the walls. There is no example in all the Scriptures or Fathers for the adoration of images; they ought to be taken for an ornament to please the sight, not to instruct the people."—Lib. *De Imag.*, p. 266. Paris, 1666.

Hincmarus, Archbishop of Rheims, says,—

"In the reign of Charles the Great (the See Apostolic willing it so to be), a General Synod was kept in Germany by the convocation of the emperor, and there, by the rules of Scriptures, and doctrine of the Fathers, the false Council of the Grecians (concerning worship of images) was utterly disannulled and overthrown." —P. 457, tom. ii., *Lutet.* Paris, 1645.

Cassander says,—

"How much the ancient Fathers in the primitive Church did abhor all manner of worshipping images, even Origen declares against Celsus."—P. 975, *Consultatio.* Paris, 1616.

Nicolaus Clemangis, an archdeacon of the Church, says,—

"The universal Church did anciently decree, that no images should be set up in churches; and this was done for the Gentiles' sake, who were converted to Christianity."—Lib. *De Novis Celebe non Instit.* 11.

Polydore Virgil says,—

"The worshipping of images, not only those who knew not our religion, but as St Jerome witnesseth, almost all the ancient Fathers, condemned for fear of idolatry."—P. 73, *sine loco aut anno.*

The Council of Frankfort says,—

"It is not to be found that any of the patriarchs, and prophets, or Fathers, did adore images, but the Scriptures cry out, to worship one God, and Him alone to adore and glorify; and the Fathers of the primitive Church did forbid the adoration of images as it appears by Epiphanius and Augustine, who reckon the worshippers of images amongst the Simonians, and the Carpocratian heretics."—*Chemnit. Exam. de Imag.*, p. 41. Frank., 1605.

Scripture Texts against Image-Worship.

Nothing can be more express than the condemnation of Image-worship by the Word of God. We give the second commandment:—

1. Exod. 20. 4. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: V 5. *Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them:* for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; V 6. And showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments.

The Roman Catholic translation of this commandment in the Douay version, is remarkable, "*Thou shalt not adore them;*" and yet the Roman Catholic Church, in spite of this plain declaration, says,—

"COME, LET US ADORE."—(See p. 200.)

The Romish Church, however, afraid of this plain command, though she has not dared to remove it from her Bibles, withdraws it as much as possible from view.

In her Catechisms, especially when *published in Romish countries*, the second commandment is NOT FOUND AT ALL!!!

We give two examples,—

Butler's Catechism, revised by Dr Doyle, gives the commandments as follows:—

"*On the Ten Commandments.*

"*Q.*—Say the ten commandments of God.

"*A.*—1. I am the Lord thy God; thou shalt not have strange gods before me.

"2. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.

"3. Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day.

"4. Honour thy father and thy mother.

"5. Thou shalt not kill."—P. 36. Dub. 1842.

Dr Reilly's Catechism, published in Monaghan, contains the following passage:—

"*Of the Second Commandment.*

"Repeat the second commandment:

"Thou shalt not take the name, &c."—P. 23.

How fearful it is, that the poor Romanist should be kept in a state of ignorance of God's law!

The Word of God further says,—

2. Lev. 26. 1. Ye shall make you no idols nor graven image, neither rear you up a standing image, neither shall ye set up any image of stone in your land, to bow down unto it: for I am the Lord your God.

3. Deut. 4. 15. Take ye therefore good heed unto yourselves (for ye saw no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spake unto you in Horeb out of the midst of the fire), V 16. Lest ye corrupt yourselves, and make you a graven image, the similitude of any figure, the likeness of male or female. V 23. Take heed unto yourselves, lest ye forget the covenant of the Lord your God, which he made with you, and make you a graven image, or the likeness of any thing, which the Lord thy God hath forbidden thee. V 24. For the Lord thy God is a consuming fire, even a jealous God.

4. Deut. 9. 12. And the Lord said unto me, Arise, get thee down quickly from hence; for thy people which thou hast brought forth out of Egypt have corrupted themselves; they are quickly turned aside out of the way which I commanded them; they have made them a molten image.

5. Deut. 16. 22. Neither shalt thou set thee up any image, which the Lord thy God hateth.

6. Deut. 27. 15. Cursed be the man that maketh any graven or molten image, an abomination unto the Lord, the work of the hands of the craftsman, and putteth it in a secret place: And all the people shall answer and say, Amen.

7. 2 Chron. 33. 7. And he set a carved image, the idol which he had made, in the house of God, of which God had said to David, and to Solomon his son, In this house, and in Jerusalem, which I have chosen before all the tribes of Israel, will I put my name for ever.

8. Isaiah 40. 18. To whom then will ye liken God? or what likeness will ye compare unto him?

9. Hab. 2. 18. What profiteth the graven image that the maker thereof hath graven it: the molten image, and a teacher of lies, that the maker of his work trusteth therein, to make dumb idols? V 19. Woe unto him that saith to the wood, Awake; to the dumb stone, Arise, it shall teach! Behold, it is laid over with gold and silver, and there is no breath at all in the midst of it. V 20. But the Lord is in his holy temple; let all the earth keep silence before him.

10. John 4. 24. God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.

11. Acts 17. 29. Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device.

12. Rom. 1. 21. Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful: but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. V 22. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, V 23. And changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things.

13. 1 Cor. 10. 20. But I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God: and I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils.

14. 1 John 5. 21. Little children, keep yourselves from idols. Amen.

15. Rev. 9. 20. And the rest of the men, which were not killed by these plagues, yet repented not of the works of their hands, that they should not worship devils, and idols of gold, and silver, and brass, and stone, and of wood; which neither can see, nor hear, nor walk.

Questions and Answers.

1. *Q.*—What arguments do Roman Catholics adduce in favour of Images?

A.—They appeal to the fact, that God commanded the Cherubims to be made, and the Brazen Serpent.

2. *Q.*—What answer do you give in reference to the Cherubims?

A.—1. They were made by an *express* command, but

Images are made in opposition to an *express* command. 2. The Cherubims were *not seen* by the people, and *not* adored. 3. The Images are exposed to view, and *adored*. Vasques, the Jesuit, admits, that the Cherubims were not either seen or adored by the people.

3. *Q.*—What answer do you give in reference to the Brazen Serpent?

A.—1. It likewise was made in accordance with an *express* command, while, as we have observed, Romish images are made in opposition to the command of God. 2. When the people worshipped the Serpent, and offered incense to it, as Romanists do to Images, good king Hezekiah commanded it to be broken. Now, this is remarkable, for the Brazen Serpent was, without doubt, a sacred relic; but when the people adored, and made an idol of it, the good king called it contemptuously, "*Nehushtan*," a "*piece of brass*."

4. *Q.*—Have any Roman Catholics admitted, that Image-worship is a novelty?

A.—Yes. Cassander, Clemangis, and others.

5. *Q.*—Is the Word of God opposed to Image-worship?

A.—Yes. Exodus xx. 4, 5; Leviticus xxvi. 1; Deut. iv. 15, 16, 23, 24; ix. 12; xvi. 22; xxvii. 15; 2 Chron. xxxiii. 7; Isaiah xl. 18; Hab. ii. 18–20; John iv. 24; Acts xvii. 29; Romans i. 21–23; 1 Cor. x. 20; 1 John v. 21; Rev. ix. 20.

6. *Q.*—Have Romanists removed the second commandment from their Catechisms?

A.—Yes, especially when published in Ireland and Roman Catholic countries.

CHAPTER XXI.

Indulgences.

NINTH ARTICLE OF THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV.

"I also affirm, that the power of Indulgences was left by Christ in the Church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people."—*Extracted from the* "Ordo Administrandi Sacramenti," p. 67. London, 1840.

THE doctrine of Indulgences is formed upon that of supererogation. The Romish system of salvation is stated in the passage which we have already quoted, at page 99, from a work entitled, "*Indulgences granted by "Sovereign Pontiffs to the Faithful, &c.*," Dublin, Powell, 1845.

We quote the following, also, on the same subject:—

"*Q.*—What is the foundation of Indulgences?

"*A.*—The superabundant satisfaction of Christ and His saints, which, by virtue of the communion of saints, is applicable to any one in a state of grace who may be indebted to God's justice.

"*Q.*—What do you mean by doing an action well?

"*A.*—I mean the doing it so, or in such a manner, that God may have no cause to find fault with it.

"*Q.*—Are good actions of any other benefit to a Christian besides making him virtuous?

"*A.*—Yes; for, moreover, every good action is *meritorious*, *impetratory*, and *satisfactory*.

"*Q.*—What do you mean by a good action being meritorious?

"*A.*—I mean that it deserves to be rewarded by God.

"*Q.*—What do you mean by its being impetratory?

"*A.*—I mean that it *claims* and solicits God's grace, and a continuance and increase of it.

"*Q.*—What do you mean by its being satisfactory?

"*A.*—I mean that it is capable of *atoning* for the punishment due to sin.

"*Q.*—Can a good action be of any service to any other besides the doer?

"*A.*—Yes, in consequence of the communion of saints.

"*Q.*—How so?

"*A.*—By a good action one may impetrate and satisfy for others as well as himself."—*Extracted from the Christian Doctrine for the use of the Diocese of Limerick, by the Right Rev. Dr Young, and reprinted under the sanction of the Right Rev. Dr Tuoay.*

From these authorities we observe, according to Roman teaching,—1. That the guilt of sin, and *eternal* punishment, are remitted in penance,—that is to say, by confession, absolution, and satisfaction. 2. That a *temporal* punishment, from non-performance of the satisfaction, may still remain to be paid off in purgatory, if not here. 3. That such temporal punishment here, and in purgatory, is remitted by good works (which are *meritorious and satisfactory*), penitential practices, and indulgences. 4. An indulgence is the remission of such punishment before or after death. 5. The merits of Christ and *His* saints are superabundant, or *supererogatory*. 6. Such

superabundance is committed to the Church, and called a *celestial treasure;* 7. To be dispensed by the Church (the Pope or Bishops*) by indulgences; 8. To be obtained by the performance of the conditions expressed in the indulgence.

The work already referred to on Indulgences, details the indulgences granted by Popes for various objects, to those who offer up certain prayers of thanksgiving to God for the exaltation of the Virgin; her assumption into heaven, &c.; who offer prayers for the Pope; who perform various devotions to the Virgin, and guardian angels and patron saints. We quote one of the prayers to the Virgin, for the recital of which an indulgence of 300 days is granted,—

"*A Prayer for Saturday.*

"O my most holy Mother, the graces thou hast obtained for me are present to my mind, and I see the ingratitude with which I have treated thee. The ungrateful are no longer worthy of favours; but I shall not, on that account, despair of thy mercy. O my great advocate, have pity on me. To thee is given the dispensation of all the graces that God grants to us, miserable creatures; and, for this purpose, God has made thee so powerful, so rich, and so benign, that thou mayest succour us. I desire to be saved. In thy hands, then, I place my eternal salvation; unto thee I commend my soul. I wish to be enrolled among thy more special servants; do not reject me. Thou goest in search of the miserable, in order to relieve them; do not, therefore, abandon a miserable sinner, who now flies to thee. Plead for me; thy Son does whatever thou askest of Him. Take me under thy protection, and that is sufficient for me, because if thou protect me, I shall fear nothing; I shall not be afraid on account of my sins, because I hope that thou wilt obtain for me of God the pardon of them; nor shall I fear the infernal spirits, because thou art able to subdue all the powers of hell; nor shall I fear on account of having Jesus for my *judge*, because one prayer of thine shall *appease* Him. Take me then under *thy* protection, dear Mother, and obtain for me the pardon of my sins, the love of Jesus, holy perseverance—a happy death; and, finally, the possession of heaven. It is true, that I do not deserve these graces; but if thou ask them for me from the Lord, I shall obtain them. Pray, therefore, to Jesus for me, who devote myself as thy servant. In thee do I

* The same work on Indulgences says, "The sovereign Pontiff alone grants *plenary* indulgences to the universal Church. Bishops do not exceed the grant of forty days of indulgence to the faithful of their respective sees, except on the occasion of the consecration of a Church when they may grant the indulgence of a year."

trust, in this hope do I repose and live, and with it will I die. Amen.

"*The* Hail Mary, *three times, as above; after which, recite* the Litany of the Blessed Virgin, *it being Saturday, a day peculiarly devoted to the honour of Mary. To this Litany there are Indulgences annexed.*"—P. 121, *Indulgences granted by Sovereign Pontiffs.* Dublin, 1845.

It would seem that the poor Roman Catholic is taught to repose his hopes chiefly on the Virgin.

The indulgences of the Church of Rome are without end. Numerous indulgences are granted to those who wear the scapular, or livery of the Virgin, a piece of brown stuff, made of that material for the reason assigned by no less than Cardinal Baronius, that the Virgin's gown was composed of the same.

Specimens of Indulgences.—We give some specimens of indulgences:—

"DEVOTIONS TO OUR GUARDIAN ANGELS AND PATRON SAINTS.

"O angel of God, to whose holy care I am committed by the supernal clemency, enlighten, defend, protect, and govern me. Amen.

"In order to animate the faithful to have recourse frequently to their angel guardian, Pius VI., by a perpetual Brief of the 2d of October, 1795, granted 100 days of indulgence every time for making this devout address; and to those who practise this prayer morning and evening through the year, a plenary indulgence on the feast of the Guardian Angels, the 2d of October, provided they confess and receive the holy Eucharist, visit a church, and pray for the pious intentions of the sovereign Pontiff. By another Brief of the 20th of September, 1796, he confirmed these indulgences, and granted also a plenary indulgence at the time of death, to those who, during life, shall have frequently said this prayer to their angel guardian.

"Pius VII., by a Decree of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences, dated the 15th of May, 1821, confirmed again the indulgences granted by his predecessor; and granted, moreover, to those who recite the above prayer, at least once a day for a month, a plenary indulgence on any day within the month, chosen by themselves, in which they go to Confession and Communion, visit a church, and pray, as usual, according to the intentions of the Pope. All these indulgences may be applied for the relief of the holy souls detained in Purgatory."—P. 135. *Ibid.*

"71ST INDULGENCE.

"*A Devotion in Honour of the Seven Griefs and Joys of St Joseph.*

"Pius VII., by a rescript of the 9th of December, 1819, granted for ever to the faithful, who practise, with contrite heart, the following exercise in honour of the sever. griefs and seven dolours

of the glorious patriarch St Joseph, an indulgence of 100 days, which can be gained but once on each day; also, an indulgence of 300 days on Wednesdays, through the year, and on every day of the two Novenas, or nine days preparatory to the principal feast of St Joseph, the 19th of March, and to the feast of his sacred patronage, which falls on the third Sunday after Easter. He granted likewise a plenary indulgence on each of these two feasts, to those who confess and receive the holy Eucharist, and recite these prayers. Moreover, a plenary indulgence, which can be gained once a month by those who practise daily this devotion, provided they approach the holy sacraments of Penance and Communion any day within the month, and pray for the Catholic Church, and according to the intentions of the sovereign Pontiff. These indulgences are applicable to the suffering souls in Purgatory."—P. 136. *Ibid.*

"72ND INDULGENCE.

"*An Act of Supplication to the Holy Apostles, Peter and Paul.*

"By a rescript, dated the 28th of July, 1778, Pius VI. granted an indulgence of 100 days, which may be gained once a day by the faithful, who, with contrite heart, recite the following prayer, with *Our Father, Hail Mary, and Glory be to the Father*, in honour of the holy apostles, Peter and Paul; also, a plenary indulgence on the feast of these Apostles, or on one of the nine days preceding, or of the seven days following their principal feast, the 29th of June, provided they confess and receive, visit some church, or an altar dedicated to these Apostles, recite this prayer, and offer their supplications for the holy Catholic Church, and according to the intentions of his Holiness."—P. 141. *Ibid.*

"75TH INDULGENCE.

"*Three Devout Aspirations to Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, which may be suggested to the Dying Christian.*

"In order to increase, among the Christian people, a true devotion towards Jesus *and Mary*, by frequently invoking their most sacred names, together with that of *St Joseph*, and to encourage the faithful to recommend themselves to *their* protection at the close of life, on which depends eternity, Pius VII., by a Decree of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences, dated 28th of April 1807, granted for ever an indulgence of 300 days each time they repeat devoutly, and with contrite heart, the following three aspirations to *Jesus, Mary, and Joseph;* and whenever they say one of these devout aspirations, he granted them an indulgence of 100 days. In both cases the indulgence is applicable to the souls of the faithful departed.

"It is recommended to make these short and pious aspirations of the soul in the day, and frequently during life, and to suggest them to sick persons in danger of death; which will afford them much spiritual comfort.

"JESUS, MARY, AND JOSEPH, I offer you my heart and soul.

"JESUS, MARY, AND JOSEPH, assist me in my last agony.

"JESUS, MARY, AND JOSEPH, may I breathe forth my soul in peace with you."—P. 144. *Ibid.*

"INDULGENCES FOR THE PURGATORIAN SOCIETIES.

"A Society has been for some years established in Dublin, under the patronage of St John, the Evangelist; the principal object of which is to assist the sick and dying, to prepare them for the last sacraments, and after their departure out of this world, to pray for their souls, and for all the souls in purgatory."*

Then follow several indulgences, as granted to such societies.

Indulgences are given to those who wear the cord of the order of St Francis round the middle,—a cord regularly blessed for the purpose,—also to those who wear the miraculous medal, struck off in obedience to the command of the Virgin, in the year 1829. For various other purposes, also, they are given.

Romish Arguments for Indulgences.

Roman Catholics quote the declaration of Christ to His Apostles in reference to binding and loosing; but

* The Rules of the Purgatorian Society are as follows:—

"1*st*, The Institution to be regulated by the superior, rector, and six of the members, *who compose the office for the dead*, who shall attend on every Wednesday night to recite, with devotion and attention, the office *for the dead*.

"2*d*, Every Catholic wishing to contribute to the relief of the suffering *souls in Purgatory*, to pay *one penny* per week.

"3*d*, A mass to be offered up on the first Monday of every month, in the parish chapel of St James's, for the spiritual and temporal welfare of the *subscribers*.

"4*th*, Each subscriber to purchase a copy of the rules; and the money arising from the weekly subscriptions, shall be paid to the most necessitated clergymen, who shall be required to give receipts for what they are paid.

"5*th*, Each *subscriber* shall be entitled to an office at the time of his death, another at the expiration of a month, and one at the end of twelve months. The benefit of masses which shall be procured by *the subscriptions*, shall be extended to their relations and friends in the following order;—Fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters, uncles, aunts; and, if married, husbands, wives, and children.

"6*th*, Every superior shall, on his death, be entitled to three masses, every rector to two, and every subscriber to one, provided he shall have died a natural death, being a subscriber for six months, and been CLEAR OF ALL DUES AT THE TIME OF HIS DEATH.

* * * * * *

"9*th*, The superior shall, on every All-Souls' day, advance to the parish priest whatever sum is necessary for obtaining insertion in the mortality list of the altar.

"*Subscriptions* received in the chapel on every Wednesday *evening*."

we have already shown, page 79, that this does not refer to the forgiveness of sin, but to the power which the Apostles possessed of binding upon the Church what is necessary to do, and of loosing from ceremonial observances,—an instance of the exercise of which we find in Acts xv. 6-29. To bind, surely, can have no reference to indulgences, which would imply *loosing alone*. Pray, how do the priests of the Church of Rome bind? If they can forgive, *can they also condemn?*

The reasons upon which the doctrine of indulgences rest, are altogether fallacious.

1. It presupposes, that God's chastisement of *love*, Heb. xii. 6, is *penal*, and extends to a future state. This notion we have dissipated in our treatise on Purgatory.

2. It presupposes, that the works of saints are not only meritorious, but, in some instances, superabundant. The doctrine of the merit of works, we have disproved under the head of Justification. If there be no merit, there can be no superabundance of merit.

We appeal to the saints themselves, and we find that they altogether discard the idea of merit:

Jacob,—

Gen. 32. 10. I am not worthy of the least of all the mercies, and of all the truth, which thou hast showed unto thy servant; for with my staff I passed over this Jordan, and now I am become two bands.

Job,—

Job 42. 6. Wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes.

David,—

Psalm 51. 3. For I acknowledge my transgressions: and my sin is ever before me.

Isaiah,—

Isa. 44. 6. But we are all as an unclean thing, and all our righteousnesses are as filthy rags; and we all do fade as a leaf; and our iniquities, like the wind, have taken us away.

Paul,—

1 Tim. 1. 15. This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of whom I am chief.

John,—

1 John 1. 7. But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.

All admit their unworthiness. Christ distinctly says, that we are unprofitable servants, even when we have done all,—

Luke 17. 10. So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do.

3. It presupposes, that to the Pope is committed the guardianship of "the celestial treasury," and the dispensation of its wealth; but this is entirely an anti-scriptural and arrogant assumption on the part of the Pope, because to Christ we are directed as the dispenser of His *own* "unsearchable riches:"—

John 1. 29. The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world!

Acts 4. 12. Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.

1 Pet. 1. 18. Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; V 19. But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot.

Rev. 22. 17. And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely.

Let us come to Him by faith.

What a creature-exalting doctrine is this, which gives to the Pope the power of dispensing the superabundant merits of Christ and His saints to those (made available also to the souls in Purgatory) who perform the conditions which he imposes.

Questions and Answers.

1. *Q.*—Upon what is the doctrine of Indulgences founded?

A.—Upon the doctrine of the supererogation of works, or that there is a superabundance of the merits of Christ and His saints, which may be applied by the Pope and

bishops for the remission of the temporal punishment of sin, and the relief of souls in Purgatory.

2. *Q.*—How are Indulgences obtained?

A.—By various means: by the repetition of certain prayers to the Virgin, to saints and guardian angels; by wearing the scapular, the garment of the order of St Francis, &c.

3. *Q.*—Upon what fallacies does the doctrine of Indulgences rest?

A.—1. It presupposes that God's chastisement of love is penal and propitiatory, and that such chastisement extends to life beyond the grave. 2. It presupposes that the works of the saints are not only meritorious, but superabundant. 3. It presupposes that to the Pope is committed the guardianship of "the celestial treasures."

CHAPTER XXII.

The Papal Supremacy.

TENTH ARTICLE OF THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV.

"I acknowledge the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church for the mother and mistress of all Churches: and I promise *and swear* true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, successor to St Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ."—*Extracted from the* "Ordo Administrandi Sacramenti," p. 67. London, 1840.

We shall consider the texts which are quoted in favour of the Papal Supremacy, in the order in which they are given in *The Grounds of Catholic Doctrine.*

Texts quoted in Favour of Papal Supremacy.

I. Peter's Confession:—

Matt. 16. 18. And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

The meaning of this text is obvious. Jesus, having heard from the disciples the various notions which were entertained of Him, asked them, "But whom say ye "that I am?" and Peter, always more forward than the rest, replied, "Thou art *the Christ*, the Son of the "living God;" and Jesus, having pronounced him

blessed, as every believer is, Psalm xxxii. 1, said, "Thou "art Peter, and upon *this* rock I will build my Church; "and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." The blessed Jesus uses the demonstrative *this* (ταύτη, taute), pointing to the confession which Peter made—"*Christ*, the Son of the living God"—as the rock.

This interpretation is confirmed by the following considerations:—

1. Christ, in addressing Peter, "Thou art Peter," (*Pétros*) uses the word Πέτρος (which signifies a *stone*); but in referring to the rock (*petra*), uses the word πέτρα, which means properly an immoveable rock. He does not say, "Thou art Peter, and upon *thee* I will build "my Church;" but upon *this* rock—the rock he had confessed, Christ the Son of the living God: as though he had said, Thou art Peter, a living stone in the spiritual edifice; but upon this *immoveable* foundation I will build my Church. He said to Peter, "Unto *thee* "will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven;" but he did not say, Upon *thee* will I build my Church.

2. Man is ever spoken of as unstable and uncertain—"dust and ashes," clay, a shadow—while the term rock, which implies immoveability and security, is employed to denote the Divine Being. He is held accursed who trusteth in man, or maketh flesh his arm, Jeremiah xvii. 5. Alas! Peter would have been a frail rock; for the very same chapter which records these words, records also the address of Christ to him:—"Get thee behind "me, Satan; thou art an offence unto me; for thou "savourest not the things that be of God, but those "that be of men," Matt. xvi. 23. Behold Peter's threefold denial of our Lord, and who can regard him as *the* rock? No! God is our rock, Psalm lxii. 2; and our rock is not as their rock,—our enemies themselves being witness, Deut. xxxii. 31.

3. Many of the Fathers plainly teach, that Christ is the rock, and not Peter.*

* Augustine says,—
"He says to them, 'But whom do ye say that I am?' and Peter,

It is true, that other Fathers sanction the Papal interpretation; but this very diversity of the Fathers, proves, (1.) That there is no "*unanimous* consent" upon the subject; (2.) That there was no universally received tradition that Peter was the rock.

4. We have already referred (p. 40) to the vital difference which exists between Roman Catholic theologians on the subject of the rock,—both parties believing that Peter was the rock, and then jumping at the conclusion that the Pope is his successor, yet differ as to a question, which, of all others, is the most important, whether their rock—the Pope—is infallible? The *ultramontane** divines argue fairly, that an infallible Church requires an infallible rock, or foundation. The others, and they are the most numerous party, hold, indeed, that the Church is infallible, but yet believe that it is built upon a fallible foundation. This, we maintain, is a far more

---

one for the rest, one for all, says, 'Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God.' This he said most rightly and truly; and he deservedly merited to receive such an answer, 'Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it to you, but my Father which is in Heaven.'—'And I say unto you,' because thou hast said this to me, listen; thou hast given me a confession, receive a blessing: therefore, 'And I say unto you, thou art Peter:' because I am *petra*, a rock, thou art *Petrus*, Peter; for *petra*, the rock, is not from *Petrus*, Peter, but *Petrus*, Peter, is from *petra*, the rock: for Christ is not so called from the Christian, but the Christian from Christ. 'And upon this rock I will build my Church:' not upon Peter, whom thou art, but upon the rock whom thou hast confessed. 'I will build my Church:' that is to say, I will build thee, who, in this answer, art a figure of the Church."—P. 1097, tom. v. Bened. Edit.

Jerome says,—

"Thou hast exalted me on a rock—thou hast led me forth because thou art become my hope. He says that he is exalted in Christ, who, according to the Apostle, is called both the firm hope and the rock of believers. Thou hast exalted me upon a rock, that is to say, upon thyself, as the following passage declares, 'But the Rock was Christ.' *Petrus*, Peter, was derived from *petra*, the Rock, whence the Lord said, Thou art Peter (*Petrus*), and upon this Rock (*petram*) I will build my Church. And in another place, The floods came, and the winds blew, and they beat upon that house, and it did not fall; for it was founded upon the firm rock, which is Christ."—P. 178, vol. vii. Paris, 1602.

* So called from their residence beyond, or north of the Alps.

serious difference of opinion than any which exists amongst orthodox Protestants. We have already shown, that these opposing opinions, taken as the premises of an argument, lead to the Protestant conclusion, that the Church is fallible. [The infallibility of the Pope has been defined.]

Blessed be God, the Rock of the Church elect, is the infallible Rock of Ages, the Lord Jesus Christ.

II. The Keys :—

Matt. 16. 19. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.

1. The grant of the keys to Peter is quoted in proof of his supremacy. The keys, it is admitted, are a figure, and imply a door. Peter used the keys, or opened the door of the Gospel Church, for he first preached to the Jews, Acts ii. 41; and to the Gentiles, Acts x.

The keys of the kingdom of glory belong only to Christ; for it is written of Christ, that it is "*He that "openeth, and no man shutteth; and shutteth, and no man "openeth,*" Rev. iii. 7.

2. The declaration as to binding and loosing, referred to *all* the Apostles, and therefore conferred no peculiar dignity on Peter; for Jesus says,—

Matt. 18. 18. Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever *ye* shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever *ye* shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.

III. Peter's Restoration :—

Luke 22. 31. And the Lord said, Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat: V. 32. But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren.

This text, reminding us of *Peter's fall*, is rather an argument *against* his supremacy. The exhortation to confirm his brethren after his conversion, would apply to any Christian, under similar circumstances of falling away. Surely Peter had need to remove from the minds of the disciples the bad effect which, no doubt, resulted from his denial with cursing and oaths!

IV. Admonition to Peter :—

John 21. 15. So, when they had dined, Jesus saith to Simon Peter, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed my lambs. V 16. He saith to him again the second time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? He saith unto him, Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed my sheep. V 17. He saith unto him the third time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? Peter was grieved because he said unto him the third time, Lovest thou me? And he said unto him, Lord, thou knowest all things; thou knowest that I love thee. Jesus saith unto him, Feed my sheep.

The threefold question, "Lovest thou me?" and the threefold exhortation to "feed," remind us again of Peter's thrice repeated denial of Jesus. He had disowned his Master three times,—he is restored to office in a thrice-repeated exhortation. He was "*grieved*," therefore no dignity was here conferred upon him, 17th verse. The commission gave no peculiar privilege to Peter. This is the duty of every minister, Acts xx. 28. The very word *pastor* (a shepherd), applied in general to ministers, is derived from the Latin word *pasco*, I feed.

Such are the texts usually quoted on this subject by members of the Church of Rome. We now prove that Peter had no supremacy over the other Apostles.

Texts against Papal Supremacy.

I. Christ taught that all the Apostles were equal,—

Matt. 23. 10. Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, even Christ. V 11. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant.

When the disciples strove amongst each other for supremacy, Jesus said,—

Mark 10. 42. Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and their great ones exercise authority upon them. V 43. But so shall it not be among you: but whosoever will be great among you, shall be your minister: V 44. And whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all. V 45. For even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.

From these passages, it is evident, that Christ conferred no superiority upon Peter; for if he had, 1. The

strife could not have arisen; and, 2. Christ would have referred to His grant of supremacy to Peter.

II. Peter himself nowhere alludes to such supremacy. He says, "The elders which are among you I exhort, "who am also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings "of Christ," 1 Peter v. 1. He here calls himself an elder and witness, but nowhere the vicar of Jesus Christ upon earth.

III. Peter was sent by the other Apostles to Samaria, "Now, when the apostles which were at Jerusalem "heard that Samaria had received the word of God, "they sent unto them Peter and John," Acts viii. 14. Just think of "his Holiness" the Pope being sent by the Cardinals to preach the Gospel! It is well known, that for many years Popes have not preached at all.

IV. A council of the Apostles and brethren was held at Jerusalem. Peter was present, and yet "the sentence "of James" was followed, Acts xv. 6–29.

V. The Apostle Paul declares, that "he was not a "whit behind the very chiefest *Apostles*," 2 Cor. xi. 5, which is inconsistent with the notion of Peter's supremacy.

VI. Peter, and James, and John, are called pillars: "James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars," Gal. ii. 9. As Peter was a pillar, he was not the foundation.

VII. Paul withstood Peter to the face, "because he "was to be blamed," Galat. ii. 11.

VIII. When Paul enumerates the various officers of the Church, he does not say, "First, the chief apostle," or, "the Vicar of Jesus Christ upon earth," or, "the "Father of kings and princes," but, "*Apostles*," Ephes. iv. 11.

Rome not the Mistress of all Churches.

The Church of Rome is called "the Mistress of all "Churches" for the following reasons, assigned in *The Grounds of Catholic Doctrine*:—

"*A.*—Because as we have already seen, her bishop is St Peter's

successor, and Christ's Vicar upon earth; and, consequently, the father and pastor of all the faithful; and therefore this church, as being St Peter's see, is the mother and mistress of all churches." —P. 54.

This notion is based on the three assumptions,—1. That Peter was Bishop of Rome. 2. That he was supreme. 3. That the Pope succeeds to his office and authority.

I. We have good reason to believe that Peter was not Bishop of Rome,—1. If Peter occupied the first post in the Christian Church in that city, *or even were there at all*, it is not likely that Paul would have omitted his name, amongst those whom he salutes in his Epistle to the Romans. 2. It is not likely that Paul, writing from Rome, would have said, that "only Luke" was with him, 2 Tim. iv. 11.

The notion of Peter's having been Bishop of Rome, is based upon uncertain tradition.

II. Even if he were Bishop of Rome, he was not supreme, as we have proved, and therefore could confer no supremacy upon the Church of Rome.

III. It is evident that the Pope is not his successor. —1. Peter was infallible in his teaching. Until 1870 many Roman Catholics maintained that the Pope is fallible. The Church of Rome of the nineteenth century differs from herself in all preceding ages! 2. Peter possessed miraculous gifts. Popes generally do not lay claim to such power. 3. The Pope does not teach the doctrine of Peter; and, as St. Ambrose says, "They have not the "inheritance of Peter, who have not the faith of Peter" (*de Pœnit.* v. 1, c. *Dis. Potest.*). Were the humble, the laborious, the spiritual-minded Apostle Peter to come on earth, would he acknowledge, as his successor, the proud Pontiff who wears the triple crown; who is borne on the shoulders of the people, and placed on the high altar of worship; who is "called God, and worshipped;" who was surrounded by foreign bayonets dyed with the blood of his flock?

If Peter did reside at Rome, and if mere residence would confer superiority, the Eastern or Greek Church

has the best claim to superiority, for the tradition which asserts that he resided in Rome, asserts also that he *first* resided in *Antioch*, an eastern city.

The Greek Church had the greatest influence in the early ages. The first Councils were held in Eastern cities, and composed, *nearly* altogether, of Eastern bishops. Four of the patriarchates were Eastern. If any Church have a claim to be called the Mistress of all Churches, it is the Church of Jerusalem, where our Lord lived, where Christianity was first preached, and from which went forth to Rome, and all the world, the glad tidings of salvation.

The Church of Rome claims to be not only the Mistress of Churches, but *the only Church;* and yet, long before the Reformation in the West, that proud claim was rejected by the Eastern Church, the most ancient, and in early days the most influential Church in the world.

Questions and Answers.

1. *Q.*—What is the meaning of the address to Peter, Matt. xvi. 18, "Thou art Peter," &c.?

A.—1. Christ did not say, "Upon *thee* I will build "my Church;" but "upon *this* rock," referring to himself—"Christ, the Son of the living God"—whom Peter had just confessed. 2. Man is ever spoken of as unstable. Peter soon showed that he would have been a frail rock, by denying his Lord. 3. Many of the Fathers give the Protestant exposition of the passage. 4. Roman Catholics have split upon the rock of their Church; some maintaining, and others denying, that their rock, the Pope, is infallible.

2. *Q.*—What was meant by giving the keys of the kingdom of heaven to Peter?

A.—That he should open the door of the Church; which he did to the Jews, as recorded in Acts ii., and to the Gentiles, as recorded in Acts x.

3. *Q.*—Does the kingdom of heaven, in this instance, mean the kingdom of glory?

A.—No. It signifies the visible Church, as in Matt. xiii. 47, where it is compared to a net which gathers of "every kind."

4. *Q.*—Who has the keys of the kingdom of glory?

A.—Christ. Rev. iii. 7.

5. *Q.*—Is Luke xxii. 31, 32, a proof of Peter's Supremacy?

A.—No. It is rather a proof against it; for it reminds us of Peter's fall.

6. *Q.*—Is the threefold address of Christ to Peter, John xxi. 15, a proof of his Supremacy?

A.—No; for we are told that Peter "was *grieved*," ver. 17, which is inconsistent with the notion, that he had received additional honour and supremacy. The threefold address was, most probably, in allusion to the *threefold denial*. It is the duty of every *pastor* to feed the lambs and sheep.

7. *Q.*—What arguments do you advance against the notion of Peter's Supremacy?

A.—1. Christ taught that all the Apostles were equal, Matt. xxiii. 10, 11. 2. Peter nowhere claims supremacy; he simply calls himself, "an elder and witness," 1 Peter v. 1. 3. Peter was *sent* by the Apostles. Could the Pope be sent? 4. At the Council of the Apostles and brethren, the sentence of James was followed, though Peter was present, Acts xv. 6–29. 5. Paul declares, that he was not "a whit behind the very chiefest "Apostles," 2 Cor. xi. 5. 6. Peter is called "a pillar," not the foundation, Gal. ii. 9. 7. Paul withstood Peter to the face, Gal. ii. 11. 8. Paul, enumerating the various officers of the Church, does not say, "First, the "Vicar of Christ;" but, First, *Apostles*, Eph. iv. 11.

8. *Q.*—Upon what is the supposed Supremacy of the Church of Rome founded?

A.—1. Upon the supposition, that Peter was Bishop of Rome. 2. That he was supreme. 3. That the Pope is his successor.

9. *Q.*—What observations do you make upon this?

A.—1. We have good reason to believe, that Peter

was not Bishop of Rome. He is nowhere mentioned in epistles either *to* or *from* that city. 2. Even if he were Bishop of Rome, he was not supreme. 3. The Pope is not his successor. Peter was infallible in his teaching. **The greater part of Roman Catholics have denied that** the Pope is infallible. 4. Peter possessed miraculous gifts. Popes generally do not claim such powers. 5. The Pope does not teach the doctrine of Peter, and, *proud in his assumption*, he is altogether unlike Peter. Besides, the tradition which states that Peter was Bishop of Rome, states that he was, before that, Bishop of Antioch. Antioch, therefore, and the Eastern Church, if any, should have the precedence before Rome.

CHAPTER XXIII.

Councils Sanction Persecution.

ELEVENTH ARTICLE OF THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV.

"I likewise undoubtedly receive and profess all other things delivered, defined, and declared, by the sacred canons and general councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent. And I condemn, reject, and anathematise all things contrary thereto, and all heresies which the Church has condemned, rejected, and anathematised."—*Extracted from the* "Ordo Administrandi Sacramenti," p. 67. London, 1840.

We have directed attention, in our preceding pages, to the leading errors of the Church of Rome. The Roman Catholic, however, professes not only to receive these, but all other things "delivered, defined, and declared," by General Councils.

Councils Intolerant.—Councils called general, teach principles, and impose a system of discipline, which must lead to the employment of physical force, in order to maintain the position, and carry out the views of the Church of Rome.

Before we proceed to the establishment of our assertion, we would notice the views of some leading Romish divines on the subject of religious liberty. Dens says,—

"Are heretics justly punished with *death?*

"*A.*—*Saint* Thomas answers in the *affirmative*, because forgers of money, or others, disturbing the republic, are justly punished with death. Therefore, *also heretics who are forgers of the faith*, and, experience being the witness, greatly disturb the republic." —*Dens*, tom. ii., No. 56.

St Thomas Aquinas, quoted by Dens, teaches the same.

Popes have taught the same principles.

"Honorius III. (1216) published a bull approving of the laws of the emperor for the extermination of heretics."—*Magnum Bullarium.* Luxemberg, 1727.

"Innocent IV. published a bull to the same effect.

"Innocent IV. published (1243) a bull authorising a crusade against heretics, granting the same indulgence to those who joined therein, as to the crusades in the Holy Land.

"Alexander IV. (1254) published a bull for the appointment of officers to discharge the functions of the Inquisition against heretics.

"Urban IV. (1262) published a bull of instruction to Inquisitors for the extermination of heretics."—*Exterminatis Vulpeculis.*

"Clement IV. (1265) with approval, refers to the bull of Innocent IV., for the extermination of heretics.

"Nicholas III. (1278) published a bull, in which he ordains that heretics shall be punished with due severity.

"John XXII. (1317) published a bull to the Inquisitors of France, in which he exhorts them to the fulfilment of their duties in extirpating heretics.

"Boniface IX. (1391) published a bull approving the intolerance of Frederick.

"Martin (1418) refers with approval to the Council of Constance, in which heretics were condemned to be burned as 'morbid sheep.'

"Innocent VIII. (1485) published a bull for the punishment of heretics.

"Julius II. (1511) published a bull anathematising heretics.

"Leo X. (1520) published a bull, in which he condemned the following proposition of Luther,—'*Hæreticos comburi, est contra voluntatem Spiritus.*'—'It is contrary to the will of God to burn heretics.'

"Clement VII. (1528) published a bull, in which he ordains that those who err shall be altogether extirpated,—'*Penitus Exterpari.*' He ordains, moreover, that their goods, moveable and immoveable, may be seized by the faithful.

"Paul III. (1536) published the bull '*Cœna Domini*,'—a bull which set up the Pope's temporal authority—a bull of which Riffensluel, a canonist, declares, that it is of force everywhere, and yet of which Dr M'Hale admitted, in his examination before the Committee of the House of Commons, that if in force, it would lead, even in this country, to a collision with the constituted authorities.

"Paul III. (1542) published a bull, in which he gives ample authority to Inquisitors.

"Paul IV. (1559) published a bull, in which he approves of all the persecuting bulls of his predecessors.

"Pius V. (1569) published a bull against Elizabeth, in which he excommunicated that Queen, and absolved her subjects from their allegiance."—*For the accuracy of these statements, see Magnum Bullarium.*

Such are the recognised principles of the Church of Rome, taught by her Doctors, Popes, and Saints, and *unreproved* by the *Index Expurgatorius.**

We now, however, appeal to Councils, and we shall prove, that the teaching even of Councils is inconsistent with civil and religious liberty.

Rome claims the Baptised.—The Council of Trent acknowledges the baptism of heretics:—

"If any one shall say, that baptism which is given by *heretics*, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, with the intention of doing what the Church does, is not true baptism,—let him be accursed."—Sess. vii., Can. 4.

And having thus acknowledged the baptism of heretics, it declares, that the baptised, heretics amongst the rest, are not *free* from the precepts of the Church, but *bound* to observe them:—

"If any one shall say that the baptised are free from all the precepts of the holy Church, whether written or delivered by tradition, so that they are not bound to observe them unless of their own will they desire to submit themselves thereto,—let him be accursed."—Sess. vii., Can. 8.

Thus every Protestant is bound, according to Romish doctrine, to observe the precepts of the Church of Rome.

* Everything contained in the works of Romish authors, at variance with Romish principles, is condemned by the *Index Expurgatorius.*

Quesnel, a great Romish writer, maintained the following proposition:—

"The reading of the Holy Scriptures is for all men."

The famous bull *Unigenitus*, was instantly published, in which that, with other scriptural propositions, was condemned.

We ask, What bulls of Popes have condemned the persecuting sentiments of Romish authors? Where has the *Index Expurgatorius* reprobated such views?

Further, the Council of Trent says,—

"If any one shall say, that when those baptised children shall have grown up, they are to be interrogated, whether they desire to ratify that which their sponsors promised in their name when they were baptised; and when they answer that they are unwilling, they are to be left to their own choice, and not to be COMPELLED (*COGENDOS*) to lead a Christian life, by any other punishment than exclusion from the Eucharist and the other sacraments, until they repent,—let him be accursed."—Sess. vii., Can. 14.

"The Holy Synod, desiring that ecclesiastical discipline should not only be established among Christian people, but also that it be perpetually preserved safe, and protected from all impediments whatsoever, in addition to these things which it appoints concerning ecclesiastical persons, decrees, that secular princes also be admonished of their duty, hoping, confidently, that they, as Catholics, whom God hath willed to be protectors of the holy faith, and of the Church, will not only concede that its own law will be restored to the Church, but also that *they bring back all their own subjects to due reverence towards the clergy*, the parish priests, and the higher orders, *nor permit* that official persons, or superior magistrates, influenced by cupidity, or by any inconsideration, *should violate the immunity of the Church and ecclesiastical persons*, appointed by the ordinance of God, and canonical sanction, but that they, together with the princes themselves, *render due observance to the sacred constitutions of the supreme Pontiffs and Councils*."—*Ibid.*

Thus the man is accursed, who says that the baptised is not to be *compelled* to receive confirmation.

Civil Rulers to enforce the Rites of the Church.—In accordance with these views, the Council of Trent teaches, that persons are to be compelled to submit to the discipline of the Church:—

"It decrees, therefore, and enacts, that the sacred canons, and all General Councils, also all other apostolic sanctions put forth in favour of ecclesiastical persons, and ecclesiastical liberty, and against those who infringe it; all of which canons, &c., also this Synod confirms by the present decree, *ought to be duly observed by all;* and therefore it admonishes the emperors, kings, republics, princes, and all and singular, of whatever state and dignity they be, that by how much the more abundantly they are endued with temporal goods, and power over others, by so much the more sacredly ought they to venerate the precepts of the ecclesiastical law, as commanded of God, and protected by His patronage; *nor should they suffer them to be transgressed by any* barons, rulers, governors, or other temporal lords or magistrates, and especially by their own servants, but that they *severely punish those who* impede the liberty, immunity, and jurisdiction of the said ecclesiastical law."—Sess. xxv., Can. 20.

* * * * "And since it is now at length

necessary to put an end to this Sacred Council, it now remains, that it admonish in the Lord, which it does, all princes, *to afford their utmost diligence that they do not permit those things which have been decided by it, to be depraved or violated by heretics, but that by them, and all other persons, they be devoutly received, and faithfully observed.*"—Sess. XXV., *De Recipiendis.*

This is plain enough. Princes are to see that those things decreed by the Council are to be devoutly received, and faithfully observed even by heretics!

The Bull of Pius IV., 1564, says,—

"BULL OF PIUS IV., 1564.—*Super Confirmatione.*—(On Confirmation.)

"But we admonish and beseech, by the bowels of mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ, our most dear son, the Emperor elect, and other Kings, Republics, and Christian Princes, that with what piety they aided the Council by their orators, with the same piety and equal care, for the sake of the Divine honour, and the salvation of their people, for reverence of the Apostolic See, and this Holy Synod, *they yield* to the prelates *their support and assistance whenever it may be necessary, in* order that *the decrees of this Council be fully observed, nor permit any opinions contrary to the true and wholesome doctrine of this Council to be received by the people subject to their government,* but that such opinions be wholly interdicted."—P. 262. *Canons of Trent.* Paris, 1832.

Such are the Statements of the Council of Trent. (See Encyclical Letter of Pius IX., p. 259, and especially p. 298.)

We now refer to the 3d Canon of the Fourth Council of Lateran, A.D. 1215, esteemed a General Council. The Canon is as follows:—

"We excommunicate and anathematise every heresy which exalteth itself against this holy, orthodox, and Catholic faith, which we have set forth above,"—that is, in the first Canon, "condemning all heretics, by whatsoever name they may be reckoned, who have indeed divers faces, but their hearts are bound together, for they make agreement in the same folly. Let such persons, when condemned, be left to the secular powers, who may be present, or to their officers, to be punished in a fitting manner: those who are of the clergy being first degraded from their office, so that the goods of such condemned persons, being laymen, shall be confiscated; but in the case of clerks, be applied to the churches from which they receive their stipends.

"But let those who are only marked with suspicion, be smitten with the sword of anathema, and shunned by all men, until they make proper satisfaction; unless, according to the grounds of suspicion, and the quality of the persons, they shall have demonstrated their innocence, by a proportionate purgation; so that if any shall remain in excommunication for a twelvemonth, thence-

forth they shall be condemned as heretics. And let the secular powers, whatever offices they may hold, be induced and admonished, and, if need be, compelled by ecclesiastical censure, that, as they desire to be accounted faithful, they should, for the defence of the faith, publicly set forth an oath, that, to the utmost of their power, they will strive to exterminate from the lands under their jurisdiction, all heretics who shall be denounced by the Church, so that, whensoever and howsoever any person is advanced, either to temporal or spiritual powers, he be bound to confirm this decree with an oath.

"But, if any temporal lord, being required and admonished by the Church, shall neglect to cleanse his country from this *heretical filth*, let him be bound with the chains of excommunication, by the metropolitan and the other co-provisional bishops. And if he shall scorn to make satisfaction within a year, let this be signified to the Supreme Pontiff, that thenceforth he may declare his vassals to be absolved from their fidelity to him, and may expose his land to be occupied by the Catholics, who, having exterminated the heretics, may, without contradiction possess it, and preserve it in purity of faith; saving the right of the chief lord, so long as he himself presents no difficulty, and offers no hindrance in this matter, the same law, nevertheless, being observed concerning those who have not lords-in-chief. But let the Catholics, who, having taken the sign of the cross, have girded themselves for the extermination of the heretics, enjoy the same indulgence, and be armed with the same privilege, as is conceded to those who go to the assistance of the Holy Land.

"But we desire, also, to subject to excommunication the believers, the receivers, the defenders, the abettors of the heretics, firmly determining, that if any such person, after he has been marked with excommunication, shall refuse to make satisfaction within a twelvemonth, he be henceforth of right in very deed infamous, and be not admitted to public offices or councils, nor to elect for anything of the sort, nor to give evidence. Let him also be intestable, so as neither to have power to bequeath, nor to succeed to any inheritance. Moreover, let no man be obliged to answer him in any matter, but let him be compelled to answer others. If, haply, he be a judge, let his sentence have no force, nor let any causes be brought for his hearing. If he be an advocate, let not his pleadings be admitted. If a notary, let the instruments drawn up by him be invalid, and be condemned with their condemned author. And we charge, that the same be achieved in similar cases. But if he be a clerk, let him be deposed from every office and benefice, that where there is the greatest fault, the greatest vengeance may be exercised. But if any shall fail to shun such persons after they have been pointed out by the Church, let them be compelled, by sentence of excommunication, to make befitting satisfaction. Let the clergy by no means administer the sacraments of the Church to such pestilent persons, nor presume to commit them to Christian burial, nor receive their alms or oblations. If they do, let them be deprived of their office, to which they must not be restored without the special indulgence of the Apostolic See."—See *Labbe's Councils.*

This Canon is referred to in the Epitome of the works of Benedict XIV.* in the following terms:—

"A bishop is bound, even in places where the tribunal of the holy Inquisition is in force, carefully and sedulously *to purge the diocese* committed to his care, *of heretics;* and if he find any, he ought to punish them according to the *canons.* He should, however, be cautious not to hinder the Inquisitors of the faith from doing their duty."

At the close of the paragraph, Benedict XIV. appeals to the following passage in the Diocesan Synods:—

"III. Among the principal cares of the pastoral office is this, diligently to watch lest any error contrary to the orthodox doctrine should creep into his diocese, which the Apostle clearly expresses in 1st Tim. cap. 3; and Tit. cap. 1. Hence, no one doubts but that it most especially belongs to the bishop to make inquiry against heretics, and against those whom he shall find obstinately persisting in their errors, TO PUT IN FORCE SEVERALLY THE CANONICAL PUNISHMENTS. . . . . AND THAT WE MAY NOT USELESSLY WASTE OUR TIME IN ILLUSTRATING A SUBJECT, UNDOUBTED AMONG ALL, IT WILL BE ABUNDANTLY SUFFICIENT TO ALLEGE ONE SANCTION OF INNOCENT III. IN THE FOURTH GENERAL COUNCIL OF LATERAN, AN. 1215, IN WHICH CAN. 3D. *De Hereticis.*"—*De Syn. Dioc.*, lib. 7, c. 32, n. 3, t. 2.

Thus the 3d Canon of the Fourth Council of Lateran, is referred to in the Diocesan Synods, quoted in the works of Dens, published for the first time in the British dominions, in Dublin, 1832.

When the *essential* principles of the Church of Rome are taken into account, it should cause no wonder that Rome is "drunken with the blood of the saints!" In the Massacre of St Bartholomew, the fires of Smithfield, and the diabolical deeds of the Confessional, we see their principles carried into practice.

Questions and Answers.

1. *Q.*—What do Dominus Dens and Saint Thomas Aquinas teach, as to the punishment of heretics?

A.—That as murderers should be put to death, so should heretics.

2. *Q.*—Who, according to Romanists, are heretics?

* Those who wish to consult this Epitome, will find it appended to the works of Liguori and Dens.

A.—These who deny any article of Pope Pius IV.'s Creed.

3. *Q.*—Are intolerant sentiments sanctioned by Councils?

A.—Yes. Especially the Councils of Trent, and the 4th of Lateran.

4. *Q.*—How does the Council of Trent sanction intolerance?

A.—By teaching, that all who are baptised, by whatsoever denomination, should be compelled to observe the precepts of the Church of Rome, and to receive Confirmation. Besides, it calls upon secular princes to compel heretics to obey the Church.

5. *Q.*—What is the object of the 3d Canon of the 4th Council of Lateran?

A.—The complete extirpation of those who do not submit to the teaching of Rome.

6. *Q.*—Has that canon been recognised by modern authorities?

A.—Yes; the Diocesan Synods, and the epitome of the works of Benedict XIV., published in the works of Dens, in 1832, at Dublin, and of Liguori, recognise it.

7. *Q.*—To what, then, may be traced the persecutions which have been carried on by the Church of Rome?

A.—To her *principles and discipline*, solemnly established in council.

8. *Q.*—What may be expected should Rome regain the ascendancy?

A.—Persecution, the rack, the torture, the stake! *There is not a country under heaven to which the Church of Rome has given Religious Liberty!**

* See Encyclical Letter of Pius IX., given on p. 259.

CHAPTER XXIV.

The Creed of Pope Pius IV. not True, not Catholic, and not Necessary to Salvation.

TWELFTH ARTICLE OF THE CREED OF POPE PIUS IV.

"I, N. N., do at this present freely profess, and sincerely hold this true Catholic faith, without which no one can be saved; and I promise most constantly to retain and confess the same entire and inviolate, with God's assistance, to the end of my life. *And I will take care, as far as in me lies, that it shall be held, taught, and preached by my subjects or by those the care of whom shall appertain to me in my situation. This I promise, vow, and swear. So help me God, and these holy Gospels of God.*"—*Extracted from the* "Ordo Administrandi Sacramenti," p. 67. London, 1840.

THIS article may be resolved into three propositions;—

1. That the faith of the Church of Rome is the true faith; 2. That it is the catholic faith; 3. That no one can be saved who does not believe it.

I. We have already disproved, in preceding pages, *the first* proposition. We have shown that the Creed of Rome is not the *true* faith. We shall now disprove the two other propositions.

II. It is not the *catholic* faith. The word *catholic* means *universal;* but it has also been employed to denote orthodoxy, or soundness of doctrine. In neither sense is the Church of Rome *catholic.*

Before we establish our assertion, we would warn the reader against the application of the word "catholic," to the Romanist. Nothing can be more improper than the use which is too often made of that term. In no sense is Rome catholic. She is the most *un*catholic Church in the world.

1. **Rome not Catholic in Numbers.**—She is not catholic, or universal, in numbers. There are about 1,000,000,000 of human beings in the world; and of these, there are only about 160,000,000 of Roman Catholics.

It will thus be seen, that infidelity is far more catholic, according to the strict meaning of the word.

At no age in the history of Christianity was the Church of Rome universal, even in Christendom. In the darkest day of Papal power, the Eastern, or Greek Church, protested against the authority and supremacy of the Pope; and be it remembered, that the Eastern Church was *the first and oldest.*

"Beginning at Jerusalem," according to the command of the Saviour, Luke xxiv. 47, the Apostles preached the Gospel to all nations. The Greek Church can make a more plausible claim to descent, in direct succession, from the Apostles, and is, to this day, a witness against the tyranny of the Church of Rome.

2. **The Roman not the Catholic Creed.**—Rome is not catholic in Creed. If catholicity signify orthodoxy, as distinguished from heresy, it by no means belongs to Rome. We have already seen, that the articles of her creed are not in accordance with Scripture. We shall now prove, that the Creed of Pope Pius IV. is a novelty unknown to the primitive Church.

In the 4th century, a great contest took place between *Arianism* and "the truth as it is in Jesus." The Church was, to a great extent, infected by false doctrine, which at one time indeed predominated.

A Synod, however, or General Council, as it is commonly called, took place at Nice, A.D. 325, when a creed, or confession of faith, hostile to Arianism, became the law of the Church. That Creed was afterwards ratified by the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381; the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431; and the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. This Creed may be seen at page 239.

That this Creed was adopted by the ancient Church as the true faith, is evident from the following passage from *Manse's Councils:*—

"This is the faith which the Fathers have expounded. First, indeed, against Arius, blaspheming and saying that the Son of God was created, and afterwards against every heresy that extols and lifts itself up against the Catholic faith and Apostolic Church, which heresy, with its authors, three hundred and eighteen bishops,

assembled together, have condemned at the aforesaid city of Nice, whose names, with their respective provinces and states, are subjoined; but the zealous servants of God have been more careful to inscribe the names of the Eastern bishops, because the Western bishops have not had a similar question as to heresies."—*Manse's Councils.* Florence Edit. Tom. ii., p. 666.

Nicene Creed the Rule of the Primitive Church.

In the early ages, the Church acknowledged no other Creed than this; yea, so decidedly, that *no other* was allowed. This is evident from the following fact:—Certain presbyters had offered another form of faith to those who wished to return from heresy, for which they were severely blamed, and, in the Council of Ephesus, a decree was passed prohibitory of such practice for the future.

Manse states the circumstance as follows:—

"A certain presbyter, by name Charisius, treasurer of the holy Church of the Philadelphians, signified that certain Lydian heretics, having renounced the error by which they were possessed, wished to return to the light of truth, and to be instructed in the true and pious principles of the Catholic Church. But, when they ought to have been led by the hand to the truth, that being led away into a more grievous error, they had fallen, as it were, from one snare into a worse one" (observe what this snare was). "For he set forth, that a certain person named Anthony, and another called James, bearing the name of presbyters, had come from the city of Constantinople, and had brought with them letters of commendation from a certain Anastasius and Photius, who themselves, also, were called presbyters, and adhered, at that time, to the heretic Nestorius; and when it had behoved to propose to those who were seeking to return from error to truth, and from darkness to light, that evangelical and apostolical tradition of the faith, which all the Fathers formerly assembled at Nice had set forth.

"That they had obtruded on them a certain exposition of impious opinions, reduced to the form of a creed, and had induced these miserable men to subscribe it, which thing truly exceeds all bounds of wickedness. For the exact evidence of these statements, the writing of the aforesaid presbyter, Charisius, was exhibited, and an exposition of that impious and depraved opinion which is concerning the incarnation of the only begotten Son of God, alone, with the subscription of those who had been deceived, are here inserted."—*Manse's Councils.* Tom. iii. Florence Edit., p. 1348.

The consequence was, that a decree was passed at the Council of Ephesus, prohibiting any creed but the Nicene.

THE DECREE OF THE FIRST COUNCIL OF EPHESUS, PROHIBITING ANY ADDITION TO THE NICENE CREED.

"These things having been read, the holy Synod decreed, THAT IT SHOULD BE LAWFUL FOR NO ONE TO PROFESS, TO WRITE, OR TO COMPOSE ANY OTHER FORM OF FAITH THAN THAT DEFINED BY THE HOLY FATHERS, WHO, WITH THE HOLY GHOST, HAD BEEN ASSEMBLED AT NICE. But those who shall have dared to compose, or to profess, or to offer ANY OTHER form of faith to those wishing to be converted to the acknowledgment of the truth, whether from Paganism or Judaism, or *from any sort of heresy;* that these, if they were bishops or clergymen, that the bishops should be *deposed* from their episcopacy, and the clergy from their clerical office; but that if they were laymen, they should be subjected to an anathema."—*Ibid.*

Nothing could be more decided than this. The ancient Church, in its General Council, positively prohibited any addition to or substitute for the Nicene Creed. Accordingly, that Creed continued to be the formula of faith, even *in the Western Church, until the* 16*th century.* False doctrine and error had been introduced from time to time; but the progress of error being gradual, the peculiar dogmas of the Church of Rome were never embodied in the form of a creed until A.D. 1564, when Pope Pius IV. first promulgated the formula which bears his name; and now the Church of Rome, in despite of the decree of the First Council of Ephesus, *which she acknowledges to be a General Council,* actually proposes an additional form of faith to converts from heresy and Judaism.

Rome's Daring Inconsistency and Violation of the Decree of the Ancient Church.

The Ordo Administrandi Sacramenti, a work used by Romish priests in Britain, contains a form of reconciling converts; and here, regardless of the ancient Councils of the old Church—Councils which Rome herself pretends to acknowledge—she proposes, in addition to the *Nicene* Creed, twelve entirely new articles, *which were never heard of as articles of the Creed, until A.D.* 1564. We enclose the New Creed in black lines, and number the new articles, to mark the distinction:—

THE OLD CREED.

"I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible: and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, begotten of His Father before all worlds, God of God, light of light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made: who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary; and was made man; and was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate. He suffered and was buried, and the third day He rose again according to the Scriptures; and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father. And He shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead; whose kingdom shall have no end.

"And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son, who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified. Who spake by the Prophets. And I believe one Catholic and Apostolic Church. I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins; and I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen."

THE NEW CREED.

I. "I most stedfastly admit and embrace Apostolic and Ecclesiastical Traditions, and all other observances and constitutions of the same Church.

II. "I also admit the Holy Scripture, according to that sense which our Holy Mother, the Church, has held and does hold, to which it belongs, to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures; neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

III. "I also profess, that there are truly and properly Seven Sacraments of the new law instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not all for every one; to wit, Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony, and that they confer grace; and that of these, Baptism, Confirmation, and Orders, cannot be reiterated without sacrilege: and I also receive and admit the received and approved ceremonies of the Catholic Church, used in the solemn administration of all the aforesaid Sacraments.

IV. "I embrace and receive all and every one of the things which have been defined and declared in the Holy Council of Trent, concerning Original Sin and Justification.

V. "I profess, likewise, that in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead; and that in the most Holy Sacraments of the Eucharist there are truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, together with soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ: and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood; which conversion the Catholic Church calls Transubstantiation. I also confess, that under either kind alone, Christ is received whole and entire, and a true Sacrament.

VI. "I constantly hold that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls detained therein are helped by the suffrages of the faithful.

VII. "Likewise, that the Saints, reigning together with Christ, are to be honoured and invocated; and that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to be held in veneration.

VIII. "I most firmly assert, that the Images of Christ, of the Mother of God, ever Virgin, and also of other Saints, may be had and retained; and that due honour and veneration are to be given them.

IX. "I also affirm, that the power of Indulgences was left by Christ in the Church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people.

X. "I acknowledge the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church, for the Mother and Mistress of all Churches, and I promise *and swear* true obedience to the Bishop of Rome, successor to St Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ.

XI. "I likewise undoubtedly receive and profess all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the Sacred Canons and General Councils, and particularly by the Holy Council of Trent; and I condemn, reject, and anathematise all things contrary thereto, and all heresies, which the Church condemned, rejected, and anathematised.

XII. "I, N. N., do at this present freely profess, and sincerely hold this true Catholic faith, without which no one can be saved; and I promise most constantly to retain and confess the same entire and inviolate, with God's assistance, to the end of my life.

"*And I will take care, as far as in me lies, that it shall be held, taught, and preached by my subjects, or by those the care of whom shall appertain to me in my situation. This I promise, vow, and swear. So help me God, and these holy Gospels of God.*"

Thus the Church of Rome has added twelve new articles to the Old Creed of the ancient Catholic Church, even in direct opposition to a Council which she acknowledges. The Creed, therefore, is *un*catholic, being opposed to the ancient Church, which Rome admits was Catholic or orthodox.

Exclusive Salvation of Rome.

III. She teaches that no one can be saved out of that faith. This assertion is both unreasonable and unscriptural.

1. IT IS UNREASONABLE. *We challenge the Church of Rome to mention a single Church which held Pope Pius IV.'s Creed until A.D.* 1564. It is repudiated by the Churches of Greece, Asia, and Russia, as well as by the Reformed Churches. Are all these Churches, with their millions of members, to be consigned to damnation, because they do not acknowledge a creed which was never heard of until the 16th century!* Even reason answers, No.

2. IT IS UNSCRIPTURAL. The Word of God connects salvation with *faith in Christ*, and not with union in any particular Church :—

John 3. 14. And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up; V 15. That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life. V 16. For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. V 36. He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.

Many other texts might be quoted, but these will suffice. Blessed be God, there is salvation in Jesus for all who believe, and "in every nation he that feareth "him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with "him," Acts x. 35.

* It is true, that Papal dogmas were introduced before that period; but they were never embodied in the form of a creed until then. The growth of Popery was gradual.

Questions and Answers.

1. *Q.*—What is the meaning of the word "Catholic?"

A.—It means universal; but it has also been employed to denote orthodoxy, or soundness of doctrine.

2. *Q.*—Is the Church of Rome catholic?

A.—No; neither as to number nor Creed.

3. *Q.*—Is it proper to apply the term "Catholic," to Romanists?

A.—No. *Most improper;* for they are not catholic, or universal, either in numbers or Creed.

4. *Q.*—How is the Church of Rome, as compared with the population of the world, neither catholic nor universal, in number?

A.—There are only 160 millions of Roman Catholics out of about 1000 millions of human beings. In number, infidelity is more catholic,—*i. e.* more universal.

5. *Q.*—How is she not catholic, or universal, in Christendom?

A.—The great Eastern Church never acknowledged her supremacy, and, with the Reformed Churches, protests against her assumed authority.

6. *Q.*—How is she not catholic, or orthodox, in Creed?

A.—Her Creed is unscriptural, and it is novel.

7. *Q.*—When was her Creed, as now held, first published?

A.—A.D. 1564.

8. *Q.*—Of what is her Creed composed?

A.—The Nicene Creed, and twelve new articles, containing all the Papal peculiarities.

9. *Q.*—When was the Nicene Creed drawn up?

A.—A.D. 325.

10. *Q.*—What was the occasion of that Creed?

A.—The Arian system, which denied the divinity of our Lord.

11. *Q.*—Did the ancient Church think that it was lawful to add to that Creed?

A.—No. In the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, it was strictly forbidden that any other creed should be proposed to converts from heresy or Judaism.

12. *Q.*—Does the Church of Rome acknowledge that Council?

A.—Yes; she admits that it was a General Council.

13. *Q.*—How then does her inconsistency appear?

A.—By adding twelve new articles to the Nicene Creed, despite of the aforesaid decree and proposing it to converts from what she calls heresy. *Thus she sets antiquity at nought, and at defiance.*

14. *Q.*—In Pope Pius's Creed the Romanist declares, that there is no salvation out of that Creed.—What say you to this?

A.—It is unreasonable and unscriptural.

15. *Q.*—Why unreasonable?

A.—Because it is absurd to suppose, that salvation is connected with a creed which was never heard of until 1500 years after Christ, and which, even now, is rejected by a large portion of the Christian world.

16. *Q.*—Why unscriptural?

A.—Because everywhere in the Bible salvation is connected with faith in Christ, and not mere union with any particular denomination.

CHAPTER XXV.

Questions to Roman Catholics on the Creed of Pope Pius IV.

1. You admit that the Eastern or Greek Church is the oldest of all churches. What infallible authority has empowered the Church of Rome to discard that communion, and to pronounce that she herself is the only Christian or Catholic Church?

2. What infallible authority has declared that the Church of Rome, though only a section of professing Christians, is infallible?

3. If General Councils—that is, Councils which represent the whole Christian Church—are alone infallible, how can the Council of Trent, and other Councils, com-

posed only of some of the Pope's bishops, be regarded as infallible?

4. Where is infallibility lodged?—(1st) Whether in Councils; or (2d) in the Pope; or (3d) in Councils with the Pope at their head?

1*st*. What infallible authority has declared that Councils are infallible? The testimony of Councils in their own favour cannot be accepted in evidence, and goes for nothing:

ALSO,

Councils have contradicted each other. What infallible authority has decided between the decrees of conflicting Councils?

2*d*. The Pope is either infallible or not. If infallible, how have Popes contradicted each other, and been guilty of heresy? If fallible, according to many Romanists, how can an infallible Church rest upon a fallible Pope?—the Pope being the supposed successor of Peter, and **Rock of the Church.** **(See Appendix.)**

3*d*. There were three rival Popes at one time. If infallibility be only in Councils with the Pope at their head, what becomes of infallibility, when it is the business of a Council to decide between the claims of opposing Popes, and when the concurrence of a Pope is impossible?

5. The Apostle warns the Church of Rome, lest she should be "cut off" like the Jewish Church, and perish; and exhorts her to be not "high-minded, but "fear," Romans xi. 17–22. How is this reconcilable with the notion of her *infallibility?*

6. The Church of Rome requires *intention* on the part of the priest for the valid administration of her Seven Sacraments, — of Baptism, the Lord's Supper, &c., Council of Trent, Sess. vii., Canon 11. How can the Romanist be certain that the Priest has intention?

7. If the priest want intention, the sacraments are invalid. How can the Romanist be certain that his sacraments are true and valid?

8. If true sacraments, according to Romish Doctrine, are necessary to the being of a Church, how can the Romanist *be certain* that he has a Church at all, much less an infallible one?

9. Either the Romanist has some other inspired rule than the Bible, or he has not. If he have, let him produce it; if he have not, what can be of Divine authority but the Bible?

10. Can any Romish bishop or priest give the infallible sense of the Church, of even one chapter of the Bible, or even of the one text, Matthew xvi. 18? Can he tell whether the Rock, who is supposed to be the Pope, is fallible or infallible? (See Appendix III.)

11. Your Church teaches, that Original Sin is taken away, and a new nature given in Baptism. But she requires that the priest, in administering that sacrament, as well as others, shall *intend* to do what the Church professes to do. You cannot tell whether the priest has intention. How, therefore, can you know, though you belong to a Church which professes to be infallible, whether the aforesaid benefits are really conferred?

12. Your Church teaches, that when the grace of Baptism is forfeited by mortal sin, grace can only be restored, except in some extraordinary case, by Absolution obtained at the tribunal of Penance. But here, again, intention is necessary on the part of the priest. How, therefore, can you know, though you belong to a Church which professes to be infallible, whether you are validly absolved in the above tribunal.

13. Your Church teaches, that "Extreme Unction" remits venial sins, and removes the "relics of sin." But here, again, the Church requires intention. When, therefore, in the dying hour you look to that rite for comfort against despair, how can you be assured that the rite itself is validly administered?

14. According to the testimony of Cardinal Baronius, an eminent Roman Catholic historian, many even of the Popes were "*monsters horrible to behold.*" Is it not most probable, that in numerous instances, intention

did not exist in the minds of such men? and is not your Church a cruel one, which makes salvation (remission of sin in Baptism, restoration in Penance, and pardon of venial sin by *Extreme Unction*) to depend on the mental act of the priest?

15. Seeing that the principles of your Church lead to so much uncertainty in all these important points, of what practical use is her assumed infallibility? and how can you be certain that you have a Christian Church at all? (See Question 4.)

16. How can the doctrine of your Church, which connects remission of sin with Baptism, Absolution, Self-Mortification, Indulgences, Extreme Unction, Purgatory, and the Mass, be reconciled with the doctrine of the Bible, which connects remission of sin with faith, and faith only, in the blood of the Lamb?

17. You worship the Host as God. You give it Divine honour. But your Church requires intention on the part of the priest when consecrating. How can you be certain that it is validly consecrated?

18. If you persist in that worship after a knowledge of this uncertainty is communicated to you, how can you be excused, on your own principles, from the charge of *wilfully* incurring the hazard of idolatry? "God is a "Spirit:" "worship him in spirit and in truth," John iv. 24.

19. Your Missal states that the Eucharist may corrupt. If the Eucharist be the body of Christ, how is this reconcileable with the inspired declaration, "Thou "wilt not suffer thine Holy One to see corruption?" Psalm xvi. 10, compared with Acts ii. 27.

20. The Apostles believed in Christ on the testimony of two senses. They *saw* and *heard*, 1 John i. 1–3. That testimony was either fallible or infallible. If fallible, then the Apostles may have been deceived. If infallible, then Transubstantiation is false, for it is opposed not merely by *two*, but the *five* senses.

21. You receive Christ's words literally when He said, "This is my body." Why do you not receive His

words literally, when He says at the *same time*, "This "cup *is* the New Testament?" Was the cup literally the New Testament? You admit, that when He said, "*this passover*," He meant the lamb which commemorated the passover. Why do you not likewise admit, that when He said, "This is my body," He meant that the bread was the commemoration of His body? Are the following texts to be understood literally?—

John 15. 1. I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman.

John 10. 9. I am the door: by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out, and find pasture.

1 Cor. 10. 4. And did all drink the same spiritual drink (for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them; and that Rock was Christ).

Rev. 22. 16. I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things in the churches. I am the root and the offspring of David, and the bright and morning Star.

Many others might be quoted.

22. You say, that in the Mass Christ is offered for the remission of sin, and yet that it is an *unbloody* sacrifice. Answer this argument: In the Mass there is no shedding of blood; but "without shedding of blood is "no remission," Heb. ix. 22; therefore in the Mass there is no remission.

23. The Roman Missal enumerates various circumstances which may occur and prevent the validity of consecration. How can you be certain that consecration takes place; and that you are not guilty of creature worship in adoring mere bread and wine?

24. Cardinal Bellarmine says, "No one can be *cer-* "*tain* with the *certainty of faith* that he has a true "sacrament, since the sacrament is not formed without "the *intention* of the minister; and no one can *see* the "*intention* of another," Tom. i., p. 488. Prag. 1721. If you cannot be certain with the certainty of faith that you have *a true sacrament*, you cannot be certain with the certainty of faith that you do not worship mere bread and wine!

25. So uncertain is the Pope in this matter, that he does not venture to receive the wafer in the Pontifical

Mass, until it has been tasted by an officer appointed for the purpose, *lest he should be poisoned.* Is it compatible with common sense to adore as God, that which may be a poisoned cake!

26. Gonzalez de Castiglio was poisoned at the altar in 1479, *Dublin R. C. Directory for* 1842. Does not this fact palpably prove that the wafer, which receives Divine worship as God, is not in every case transubstantiated?

27. The Pope adopts the above precaution for the preservation of his *body;* and the *Ceremoniale Episcoporum* prescribes that bishops shall do the same. But the salvation of the soul, which is infinitely more important, is endangered by idolatry. Does not, therefore, common prudence dictate, that it behoves you to abstain from Host worship, seeing that, according to Roman Catholic principles, it is so perilous?

28. The Roman Church teaches, that the Eucharist is *truly, really,* and *substantially* the body, blood, soul, and divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ. The Roman Missal contains the following passage:—"If the Priest "vomit ('*vomat*') the Eucharist." Does it not amount to blasphemy to teach that the Divine Being can be disgorged from the stomach of worm man?

29. The Roman Missal contains the following passage:—"If the consecrated Host disappear by any accident, "as by the *wind,* or by a miracle, or by *any* animal," &c. If this be true, the Lord of life and glory (O how fearfully irreverent is Romish doctrine!) may become the prey of a mouse!

30. Christ is now an *exalted* Saviour. "Wherefore "God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a "name which is above every name," Philippians ii. 9. He is far beyond the reach of humiliation, for the season of His humiliation terminated when He ascended up on high. How can this truth be reconciled with the above degradation, to which He is exposed according to Romish doctrine?

31. The Scriptures represent Christ as bodily absent

from, though spiritually present with, His people: "For "ye have the poor always with you; but *me* ye have not "always," Matthew xxvi. 11. How is this reconcileable with the Romish doctrine, that Christ, in His *literal body, is always* on the altar?

32. There are five senses,—Sight, Hearing, Smelling, Tasting, and Feeling. If you were deprived of even two of these, *Sight* and *Hearing*, you could know nothing of Priests, Traditions, Councils, the Church, or anything else. The senses are the channel through which all knowledge is conveyed. *All* your senses testify that the wafer is not a human body. How can you consistently receive the evidence of *two* in the former case, and reject the evidence of *all* in the latter?

33. The Word of God says, "Cursed is every one "that continueth not in *all* things which are written in "the book of the law to do them," Gal. iii. 10. "Sin "is the transgression of the law," 1 John iii. 4. Now, either the Lawgiver (and He *only* can do it) has exempted some transgressions from that curse, or He has not. If He have, *where* is that exemption recorded? If He have not, how dare your priests pronounce that some sins are only venial; that is, do not deserve the woe denounced?

34. Either your priests have authority for teaching that temporal punishment for sin extends *beyond the grave*, or they have not. If they have, let them produce that authority. If they have not, let them no longer make "merchandise of souls" by taking money for masses, in order to relieve souls who are falsely supposed to undergo that temporal punishment in Purgatory.

35. Absolution, according to your Church, remits the eternal guilt of mortal sin; Indulgences remit the temporal punishment of mortal sin; and Extreme Unction remits venial sin. Now, if sin be remitted in all its forms as above, which are so varied according to your Church, *what need* is there of, or what sin remains for Purgatory?

36. Your priests either believe, or they do not, that

the eternal guilt of sin, the temporal punishment of sin, and venial sin, are remitted by Absolution, Indulgences, and Extreme Unction, respectively. If they do believe that sin, in all its forms, is so remitted, do they not practise an imposture for the sake of gain, when they offer up masses for the souls of the departed in every case? If they do not believe that sin is so remitted, they deny the doctrine of their Church.

37. If *all* sin of the believer be taken away, there is no need of Purgatory; but "the blood of Jesus Christ "His Son cleanseth us from *all* sin," 1 John i. 7; therefore there is no need of Purgatory.

38. If the believer, when he dies, enters into rest, he cannot go into the torments of Purgatory; but the believer, when he dies, enters into rest:—

Isaiah 57. 2. He shall enter into peace: they shall rest in their beds, each one walking in his uprightness.

Philip. 1. 21. For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain.

Rev. 14. 13. And I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; and their works do follow them.

Therefore he cannot go into the torments of Purgatory.

39. The Church which teaches, or sanctions the teaching, that Mary is more willing to receive sinners than Christ, dishonours the Redeemer; but the Church of Rome teaches, that Mary is more willing to receive sinners than Christ (as is evident from *The Glories of Mary*, by *Saint* Alphonsus Liguori, and several other Roman Catholic works); therefore the Church of Rome dishonours the Redeemer.

40. According to the doctrine of the Church of Rome, the patriarchs and saints, before the coming of Christ, were confined in a place called the *Limbo Patriarchum*. Now, this is either true or false. If true, it is quite evident that there was no such thing as Invocation of Saints for four thousand years; for what benefit could have resulted from prayers to souls in *Limbo?* If false, your Church teaches falsehood.

41. The high priest in the holy of holies was a type of Christ, our High Priest and Mediator, Heb. ix. 11–24; but none dare officiate in the holy of holies but the high priest; therefore, to carry out the type, we must believe that none can mediate in heaven, *the true holy of holies*, but the Apostle and High Priest of our profession, "Jesus Christ."

42. If the *Saints* are not omniscient, they cannot hear our prayers; but the saints are not omniscient (for omniscience is the attribute of God alone); therefore the saints cannot hear our prayers.

43. You pray to persons whom you believe to be saints in heaven. What *infallible* authority have you for believing that they are saints?

44. If you answer, I believe they are saints because they are canonized; then we ask again, Are you certain that the parties who conducted that canonization and weighed the evidence, are infallible?

45. We recur to a former question, Where is infallibility lodged? (Nos. 2 and 4.) Perhaps you will answer, as some have done, "In the General Council "with the Pope at its head." Recollect, however, that the evidence of saintship is not examined, nor the canonization itself conducted by a Council with a Pope at its head. (See Appendix III.)

46. Canonization is either fallible or infallible. If infallible, then you must believe, contrary to the great body of Roman Catholics, and contrary to fact, that the Pope is infallible; for canonization is conducted by him, assisted by a few divines. If fallible, it follows, that when you think you are praying to glorified spirits, you may perhaps be invoking *lost souls in hell!* (See as before.)

47. You frequently deny that you adore the *Cross*. How is that denial consistent with the following declaration in the *Roman Missal?*—

"Then the other clergy and laity, two by two, thrice kneeling, as aforesaid, *adore the cross*."—*Service for Good Friday.*

48. You frequently deny that you pray to the Cross. How is that denial consistent with the following prayer?—

"O Cross, more splendid than all the stars, illustrious to the world, much beloved by men, more holy than all things; who alone wast worthy to bear the treasure of the world, *sweet wood, sweet nails*, bearing a sweet burden, save this present multitude assembled to-day in thy praise."—*Roman Breviary.*

49. The Second Commandment, as translated in your Douay version, says, "Thou shalt *not adore* them nor "serve them" (graven things). Is not your Church directly antichristian, when, in despite of this command, she says, "*Come, let us adore*," and when the clergy and laity, "two by two, thrice kneeling, as aforesaid, *adore* "*the cross?*"—*Roman Missal, Rubric for Good Friday.*

50. Could you, with any degree of consistency, write over your Images, the commandment, "Thou shalt *not* "*adore* them nor serve them," and then fall down and adore them?

51. Christianity was first preached in Jerusalem, according to the declaration of our Lord, "that repentance "and remission of sins should be preached in his name "among all nations, *beginning at Jerusalem*," Luke xxiv. 47; and a Christian Church first founded there, Acts ii. The Church of Jerusalem existed for several years before the Church of Rome. How can the Church of Rome be the mother of *all* Churches, if she were not the *first* Church, and if she herself is the daughter of the Church of Jerusalem?

If the Church of Rome is not the first Church, she is not the mother of all Churches; but she is not the first Church; therefore she is not the mother of all Churches.

52. The Church of Jerusalem flourished ere the Church of Rome had an existence. Either union with the Church of Rome is essential to the being and truth of a Church, or it is not. If it be essential, the Church of Jerusalem was not a true Church, for it could have had no union with Rome, which was not in existence. If it be not essential, the Papal system falls to the ground.

53. If Peter were "Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar "of Christ upon earth," how is it that Christ said to the Apostles, and Peter amongst them, "Neither be ye

"called masters, for one is your master, Christ?" **Matt.** xxiii. 10.

If it were unlawful for one Apostle to assume to be a master over the rest, how much more would it have been unlawful for Peter to have assumed to be "the Prince "of the Apostles, and Vicar of Christ!" How is it that we nowhere read of any peculiar authority being assigned to Peter?

54. If the Pope be the successor of Peter, how is it that he is so unlike Peter in every respect? Was Peter carried on the shoulders of men in procession, and placed over the consecrated elements? Did Peter wear a triple crown, to indicate that he was supreme pontiff, king, and emperor? Was Peter a prince, and did he employ the sword and the torture to establish his claims?

The office of Peter was that of an apostle or preacher; the Pope for centuries has never preached. How unlike is the Pope (whose proud pretensions and sword have carried woe into every nation) to Peter, the "elder "and witness of the sufferings of Christ," 1 Peter v. 1.

55. What is a General Council? Is it not an assembly of delegates from the whole Church—*from the eastern*, as well as the western branch, such as the first Councils were?

How can the Councils of the Church of Rome, which established Papal doctrine, be regarded as general councils, since no delegates from the Eastern Church were present?

56. In Pope Pius's Creed you say, "I do at this pre-"sent freely profess, and sincerely hold, this true "Catholic faith, *without which no one* can be saved."

Either this Creed is necessary, or it is not. If it be necessary to salvation, the whole Christian Church was damned until A.D. 1564, when first Pope Pius's Creed was published. If it be not necessary, the Creed is false.

Roman Catholics, look to Jesus! He is the unchanging High Priest,

> "Whose heart is made of tenderness,
> And overflows with love."

His blood cleanseth from *all* sin, 1 John i. 7. Look to the one sacrifice of Calvary: for "by *one* offering He "hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified," Heb. x. 14.

SUPPLEMENTAL PAPER.

An *anonymous* writer, subscribing himself "A Catholic "Layman," but who may be, for aught that we know, the mere *amanuensis* of Bishop Gillis, or the priests, has addressed a long reply in manuscript to the Rev. R. P. Blakeney's questions.

No. I.

In reference to question 4, he says, "*The infallibility* "*of Councils headed by the Pope*, for no individual opi- "nion, concerning any other source of infallibility, am "I called upon to consider, is, *infallibility in faith.*" (The italics are his.) In reply to the question, "What "infallible authority has declared, that Councils headed "by the Pope are infallible in matters of faith?" he says, "I then answer as follows:—The infallible autho- "rity of our blessed Lord and Saviour has declared it. "When you object, as doubtlessly you will, how we "know He has declared it, I answer, 1*st*, That we know "it, and know it infallibly, by tradition." *Anonymous*, when asked to give infallible authority for believing that Councils with the Pope are infallible, gives *tradition!!!* We now call upon him (1.) To name that tradition; and (2.) To prove that it is infallible. The Greek Church appeals to tradition, and, *led thereby*, it denies that Councils with the Pope at their head are infallible. We ask, What independent infallible authority has declared that the Greek Church is in error, and the Roman Church right?

No. II.

Further, on the same subject, *Anonymous* says, "That "tradition, or the testimony of men, subject to certain "conditions, which our tradition possesses, is able, *by "itself alone*, to support an infallible assurance, and that "so surely, that a miracle worked for the express pur- "pose would not increase its certainty." 1. We call upon *Anonymous* to state what these conditions are, and to show how an *oral* communication, handed down from mouth to mouth, could give any, much less an *infallible* assurance. 2. If tradition, "*by itself alone*," be able to give such an "infallible assurance," what need is there of Councils and Popes at all to interpret them? or what need is there of the Scriptures at all?

DILEMMA No. 1.—Either such tradition needs an interpreter, or it does not. If it does need an interpreter, and if the infallible interpreter be "Councils headed "by the Pope," then we ask, "What Councils headed "by the Pope have interpreted tradition, and conse- "quently declared, that Councils headed by the Pope "are infallible?" If tradition does not need such interpreter, then we may dispense with Councils headed by the Pope. Will *Anonymous* have the kindness to extricate himself from the horns of this dilemma, if he can?

No. III.

We had asked, "What becomes of infallibility when "it is the business of a Council to decide between the "claims of opposing Popes?" He gives Mumford's reply, "Though a Council without a Pope cannot define "any article of faith; yet, in time of schism, it can judge "which is true Pope, and provide the Church of a true "Pastor if she had none." We answer, (1.) That Mumford was a mere individual; as such, he says, that a Council without a Pope "cannot define any article of "faith." The Council of Constance declared otherwise. (*See Labbe's Councils*, tom. xii., p. 22. Paris, 1672.) This affords us a specimen of the difference of opinion existing in the Church of Rome on fundamental points.

(2.) Here Mumford declares that a Council cannot define without a Pope, and *Anonymous* tacitly admits that it does not possess infallibility in such circumstances; for he asks, "Is the act of choosing a Pope one that requires "the exercise of infallibility?" Common sense teaches, that if a Church be infallible at all, it ought especially to be infallible when called on to pronounce which of two Popes is the Vicar of Christ and the Rock of the Church.

DILEMMA No. 2.—Either the Council is fallible or infallible. If fallible, it may reject the true Pope. If infallible, Councils without a Pope are infallible.

No. IV.

Anonymous makes a distinction between articles of faith; and (1.) He intimates that the infallibility of Councils is an opinion.

DILEMMA No. 3.—He has infallible authority for his belief in that distinction, or he has not. If he have infallible authority, let him name the Council headed by the Pope which declares that distinction. If he have not such authority, he is inconsistent with himself, for he believes without infallible authority. (2.) But even if we conceded his distinction, which we do not, the difficulty still remains. THERE ARE CASES IN WHICH A COUNCIL WILL HAVE TO PRONOUNCE UPON ARTICLES OF FAITH WITHOUT THE POPE. Pope Adrian VI., Alphonsus a Castro, and several great authorities in the Church of Rome, maintained that the Pope might become a heretic. If so, the Council may then have to decide upon an article of faith without a Pope.

DILEMMA No. 4.—Either the Council is infallible or not, under such circumstances. If infallible, Councils are infallible *without* a Pope. If fallible, there is no infallible authority to decide the point.

No. V.

Anonymous argues, that if the Council headed by the Pope be not infallible, we have no satisfactory authority

for Holy Scripture! The old infidel argument again! a thousand times urged, and as often refuted. We believe in the genuineness, authenticity, and inspiration of the Bible on *evidence.*

Dilemma No. 5.—Either that evidence is sufficient, or it is not. If sufficient, *Anonymous* is foiled. If insufficient, what can *Anonymous* give in its stead—the assertions of a few clergymen, or, in other words, the decrees of Councils? As well might the authority of Mohammedan priests prove the Koran

No. VI.

Anonymous admits "the possibility of a priest's *pre-* "*tending* to consecrate, baptise, marry, &c., without due "intention;" and he adds, that "*Sacraments adminis-* "*tered without intention are invalid.*" But he argues that the Romanist may be morally certain that intention exists. We answer, (1.) That the plea of *moral* certainty is inconsistent on the part of a Romanist, who, on other matters, insists upon the necessity of *infallible* certainty. Dr Browne, a Roman Catholic bishop, in his late letter to Mr Bailley, argues that Christians should have "*absolute certainty.*" (2.) The Romanist cannot have moral certainty. As he looks back upon the long line of succession, and numerous links in the chain, let him recollect, that even if one link be broken, if there be one invalid ordination or baptism, the whole line is lost! Baronius says, that Popes have been "monsters horrible to behold." Is it not morally certain, that already innumerable *nullities* in baptism, ordination, &c., have taken place

Dilemma No. 6.—Either Romanists are infallibly certain that they have true Sacraments, or they are not. If they are infallibly certain, then the doctrine of their Church as to intention is false. If they are not infallibly certain, their pretension to infallibility is practically useless.

No. VII.

Anonymous, in reference to the words, "This cup *is*

"the New Testament," says, "Our Lord explains *that* "*it is a figure.*" Just so; and thus are the words figuratively spoken at the same time, "This is my body."

No. VIII.

Anonymous denies that several passages which we quote prove that the Bible is the rule of faith. He does not even *attempt* to substantiate his assertion, but refers us to Dr Wiseman's book, as, in other places, he refers to Lingard, Mumford, and Bossuet's works on other points. We were quite aware that books were written by these persons, and we were as well aware that *they have been answered.* It is with *Anonymous himself*, however, that we have now to do, and his arguments. Of his personalities, and his expressions of contempt, &c., we take no notice. They are worthy of his cause.

Table of Councils.

By Œcumenical or General Councils, are understood those Assemblies of Bishops which have been held at different times, and have been supposed to represent the whole body of the Christian Church These are generally reckoned, viz.,—

1. The First Council of Nice, A.D. 325.
2. The First Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381.
3. The Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431.
4. The Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451.
5. The Second Council of Constantinople, A.D. 553.
6. The Third Council of Constantinople, A.D. 680.
7. The Second Council of Nice, A.D. 787.
8. The Fourth Council of Constantinople, A.D. 869.

To those the Romanists add the following: but they have no claim to the title of "Œcumenical," or "General," from their having been attended by none but the Pope's Bishops, and from their not having been *free*,—

9. The First Council of Lateran, in Rome, A.D. 1123.
10. The Second Council of Lateran, A.D. 1139.
11. The Third Council of Lateran, A.D. 1179.

12. The Fourth Council of Lateran, A.D. 1215.
13. The Council of Lyons, A.D. 1245.
14. The Second Council of Lyons, A.D. 1274.
15. The Council of Vienna, A.D. 1311.
16. The Council of Florence, A.D. 1439.
17. The Fifth Council of Lateran, A.D. 1512.
18. The Council of Trent, A.D. 1545.
19. The Council of the Vatican, A.D. 1870.

Besides the above, there was a Council held at Constance, A.D. 1414, which condemned Huss and Jerome of Prague, and denied the cup to the laity. This Council is allowed by the Romanists to have the authority of a General Council with respect to its last Sessions.

The Second Council of Nice, A.D. 787, was convened by the influence of the Empress Irene, a woman of depraved character, and a partizan of images. Charlemagne, in the Caroline Books, protested against its decrees in favour of images, and reproached the Council for being guided by a woman. The Council of Frankfort, A.D. 794, protested against the decrees of the Second Council of Nice.

The Fourth Council of Constantinople, A.D. 869, was rejected by the Greek Church.

APPENDIX.

(No. I.)

THE

ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF PIUS IX.,

8th December 1864,

PROCLAIMING THE JUBILEE OF 1865:

WITH THE

SYLLABUS OF THE LXXX ERRORS

WHICH HE CONDEMNS:

WITH AN ENGLISH TRANSLATION, EXHIBITING THESE EIGHTY ERRORS IN NEGATIVE AND AFFIRMATIVE PROPOSITIONS, AND A FEW NOTES.

VENERABILIBUS FRATRIBUS PATRIARCHIS, PRIMATIBUS, ARCHIEPISCOPIS, ET EPISCOPIS UNIVERSIS GRATIAM ET COMMUNIONEM APOSTOLICÆ SEDIS HABENTIBUS,

PIUS P.P. IX.

VENERABILES FRATRES,

SALUTEM ET APOSTOLICAM BENEDICTIONEM.

Quanta cura ac pastorali vigilantia Romani Pontifices Prædecessores Nostri exsequentes demandatum sibi ab ipso Christo Domino persona Beatissimi Petri, Apostolorum Principis officium, munusque pascendi agnos et oves nunquam intermiserint universum Dominicum gregem sedulo enutrire verbis fidei, ac salutari doctrina imbuere, eumque ab venenatis pascuis arcere, omnibus quidem ac Vobis præsertim compertum, exploratumque est, Venerabiles Fratres. Et sane iidem Decessores Nostri augustæ Catholicæ Religiones, veritatis ac justitiæ assertores et vindices, de animarum salute maxime solliciti nihil potius unquam habuere, quam sapientissimis suis Litteris, et Constitutionibus retegere et damnare omnes hæreses et errores, qui Divinæ Fidei nostræ, Catholicæ Ecclesiæ doctrinæ, morum honestati, ac sempiternæ hominum saluti adversi, graves frequenter excitarunt tempestates,

et christianam civilemquæ rempublicam miserandum in modum funestarunt. Quocirca iidem Decessores Nostri Apostolica fortitudine continenter obstiterunt nefariis iniquorum hominum molitionibus, qui despumantes tamquam fluctus feri maris confusiones suas, ac libertatem promittentes, cum servi sint corruptionis, fallacibus suis opinionibus, et perniciosissimis scriptis Catholicæ Religionis civilisque societatis fundamenta convellere, omnemque virtutem ac justitiam de medio tollere, omniumque animos mentesque depravare, et incautos, imperitamque præsertim juventutem a recta morum disciplina avertere, eamque miserabiliter corrumpere, in errores laqueos inducere, ac tandem ab Ecclesiæ Catholicæ sinu avellere conati sunt.

Jam vero, uti Vobis, Venerabiles Fratres, apprime notum est, Nos vix dum arcano divinæ providentiæ consilio nullis certe Nostris meritis ad hanc Petri Cathedram evecti fuimus, cum videremus summo animi Nostri dolore horribilem sane procellam tot pravis opinionibus excitatam, et gravissima, ac nunquam satis lugenda damna, quæ in Christianum populum ex tot erroribus redundant, pro Apostolici Nostri Ministerii officio illustria Prædecessorum Nostrorum vestigia sectantes Nostram extulimus vocem, ac pluribus in vulgus editis Encyclicis Epistolis et Allocutionibus in Consistorio habitis, aliisque Apostolicis Litteris præcipuos tristissimæ nostræ ætatis errores damnavimus, eximiamque vestram episcopalem vigilantiam excitavimus, et Universos Catholicæ Ecclesiæ Nobis carissimos filios etiam atque etiam monuimus et exhortati sumus, ut tam diræ contagia pestis omnino horrerent et devitarent. Ac præsertim Nostra prima Encyclica Epistola die 9 Novembris 1846 Vobis scripta, binisque Allocutionibus, quarum altera die 9 Decembris anno 1854, altera vero 9 Junii anno 1862 in Consistorio a Nobis habita fuit, monstruosa opinionum portenta damnavimus, quæ hac potissimum ætate cum maximo animarum damno, et civilis ipsius societatis detrimento dominantur, quæque non solum Catholicæ Ecclesiæ, ejusque salutari doctrinæ ac venerandis juribus, verum etiam sempiternæ naturali legi a Deo in omnium cordibus insculptæ, rectæque rationi maxime adversantur, et ex quibus alii prope omnes originem habent errores.

Etsi autem haud omiserimus potissimos hujusmodi errores sæpe proscribere et reprobare, tamen Catholicæ Ecclesiæ causa, animarumque salus Nobis divinitus commissa, atque ipsius humanæ societatis bonum omnino postulant, ut iterum pastoralem vestram sollicitudinem excitemus ad alias pravas profligandas opiniones, quæ ex eisdem erroribus, veluti ex fontibus, erumpunt. Quæ falsæ ac perversæ opiniones eo magis detestandæ sunt, quod eo potissimum spectant, ut impediatur et amoveatur salutaris illa vis, quam Catholica Ecclesia ex divini sui Auctoris institutione, et

mandato libere exercere debet usque ad consummationem sæculi non minus erga singulos homines, quam erga nationes, populos summosque eorum Principes, utque de medio tollatur mutua illa inter Sacerdotium et Imperium consiliorum societas et concordia, quæ rei cum sacræ tum civili fausta semper extitit ac salutaris.* Etenim probe noscitis, Venerabiles Fratres, hoc tempore non paucos repiriri, qui civili consortio impium absurdumque *naturalismi*, uti vocant, principium applicantes, audent docere, "optimam societatis publicæ rationem, civilemque progressum omnino requirere, ut humana societas constituatur et gubernetur, nullo habito ad religionem respectu, ac si ea non existeret, vel saltem nullo facto veram inter falsasque religiones discrimine." Atque contra Sacrarum Litterarum, Ecclesiæ, sanctorumque Patrum doctrinam, asserere non dubitant, "optimam esse conditionem societatis, in qua Imperio non agnoscitur officium coercendi sanctitis pœnis violatores Catholicæ Religionis, nisi quatenus pax publica postulet." Ex qua omnino falsa socialis regiminis idea haud timent erroneam illam fovere opinionem Catholicæ Ecclesiæ, animarumque saluti maxime exitialem a rec. mem. Gregorio XVI. prædecessore Nostro *deliramentum* appelatum,† nimirum "libertatem conscientiæ, et cultuum esse proprium cujuscumque hominis jus, quod lege proclamari, et asseri debet in omni recte constituta societate, et jus civibus inesse ad omnimodam libertatem nulla vel ecclesiastica, vel civili auctoritate coarctandam, quo suos conceptus quoscumque sive voce, sive typis, sive alia ratione palam publiceque manifestare, ac declarare valeant." Dum vero id temere affirmant, haud cogitant et considerant, quod *libertatem perditionis*‡ prædicant, et quod "si humanis persuasionibus semper disceptare sit liberum, nunquam deesse poterunt, qui veritati audeant resultare, et de humanæ sapientiæ loquacitate confidere, cum hanc nocentissimam vanitatem quantum debeat fides et sapientia christiana vitare, ex ipsa Domini nostri Jesu Christi institutione cognoscat."§

Et quoniam ubi a civili societate fuit amota religio, ac repudiata divinæ revelationis doctrina et auctoritas, vel ipsa germana justitiæ humanique juris notio tenebris obscuratur et amittitur, atque in veræ justitiæ legitimique juris locum materialis substituitur vis, inde liquet cur, nonnulli certissimis sanæ rationis principiis penitus neglectis posthabitisque, audeant conclamare, "voluntatem populi, publica, quam dicunt, opinione vel alia ratione manifestatam constituere supremam legem ab omni divino

* Gregor. XVI. Epist. Encycl. *Mirari*, 15 Aug. 1832.
† Eadem Encycl. *Mirari*.
‡ S. Aug. Epist. 105, Al. 166.
§ S. Leo, Epist. 164. Al. 133. § 2 edit. Ball.

humanoque jure solutam, et in ordine politico facta consummata, eo ipso quod consummata sunt, vim juris habere." Verum ecquis non videt, planeque sentit, hominum societatem religionis ac veræ justitiæ vinculis solutam nullum aliud profecto propositum habere posse, nisi scopum comparandi, cumulandique opes, nullamque aliam in suis actionibus legem sequi, nisi indomitam animi cupiditatem inserviendi propriis voluptatibus et commodis? Eapropter hujusmodi hominis acerbo sane odio insectantur Religiosas Familias quamvis de re christiana, civili, ac literaria summopere meritas, et blaterant, easdem nullam habere legitimam existendi rationem, atque ita hereticorum commentis plaudunt. Nam ut sapientissime rec. mem. Pius VI. Decessor Noster docebat "regularium abolitio lædit statum publicæ professionis consiliorum evangelicorum, lædit vivendi rationem in Ecclesia commendatam tanquam Apostolicæ doctrinæ consentaneam, lædit ipsos insignes fundatores, quos super altaribus veneramur, qui a Deo inspirati eas constituerunt societatis."* Atque etiam impie pronunciant, auferendam esse civibus Ecclesiæ facultatem "qua eleemosynas christianæ caritatis causa palam erogare valeant," ac de medio tollendam legem "qua certis aliquibus diebus opera servilia propter Dei cultum prohibentur" fallacissime prætexentes, commemoratam facultatem et legem optimæ publicæ œconomiæ principiis obsistere. Neque contenti amovere religionem a publica societate, volunt religionem ipsam a privatis etiam arcere familiis. Etenim funestissimum *Communismi* et *Socialismi* docentes ac profitentis errorem asserunt "societatem domesticam seu familiam totam suæ existentiæ rationem a jure duntaxat civili mutuari; proindeque ex lege tantum civili demanare ac pendere jura omnia parentum in filios, cum primis vero jus institutionis, educationisque curandæ." Quibus impiis opinionibus machinationibusque in id præcipue intendunt fallacissimi isti homines, ut salutifera Catholicæ Ecclesiæ doctrina ac vis a juventutis institutione et educatione prorsus eliminetur, ac teneri flexibilesque juvenum animi perniciosis quibusque erroribus, vitiisque misere inficiantur ac depraventur. Siquidem omnes, qui rem tum sacram, tum publicam perturbare, ac rectum societatis ordinem evertere, et jura omnia divina et humana delere sunt conati, omnia nefaria sua consilia, studia et operam in improvidam præsertim juventutem decipiendam ac depravandam, ut supra innuimus, semper contulerent, omnemque spem in ipsius juventutis corruptela collocarunt. Quocirca nunquam cessant utrumque clerum, ex quo, veluti certissima historiæ monumenta splendide testantur, tot magna in christianam, civilem, et litterarium rempublicam com-

* Epist. ad Card. de la Rochefoucault, 10 Martii, 1791.

moda redundarunt, quibuscumque infandis modis divexare, et edicere, ipsum Clerum "utpote vero, utilique scientiæ et civilitatis progressui inimicum ab omni juventutis instituendæ educandæque cura et officio esse amovendum."

At vero alii instaurantes prava ac toties damnata novatorum commenta, insigni impudentia audent, Ecclesiæ et hujus Apostolicæ Sedis supremam auctoritatem a Christo Domino ei tributam civilis auctoritatis arbitrio subjicere, et omnia ejusdem Ecclesiæ et Sedis jura denegare circa ea quæ ad exteriorem ordinem pertinent. Namque ipsos minime pudet affirmare "Ecclesiæ leges non obligare in conscientia, nisi cum promulgantur a civili potestate; acta et decreta, Romanorum Pontificum ad religionem et Ecclesiam spectantia indigere sanctione et approbatione, vel minimum assensu potestatis civilis; constitutiones Apostolicas,* quibus damnantur clandestinæ societates, sive in eis exigatur, sive non exigatur juramentum de secreto servando, earumque asseclæ et fautores anathemate mulctantur, nullam habere vim in illis orbis regionibus ubi ejusmodi aggregationes tolerantur a civili gubernio; excommunicationem a Concilio Tridentino et Romanis Pontificibus latem in eos, que jura possessionesque Ecclesiæ invadunt, et usurpant, niti confusione ordinis spiritualis, ordinisque civilis ac politici ad mundanum dumtaxat bonum prosequendum; Ecclesiam nihil debere decernere, quod obstringere possit fidelium conscientias in ordine ad usum rerum temporalium; Ecclesiæ jus non competere violatores legum suarum pœnis temporalibus coercendi; conforme esse sacræ theologiæ, jurisque publici principiis, honorum proprietatum, quæ ab Ecclesiæ, a Familiis Religiosis, aliisque locis piis possidentur, civili gubernio asserere, et vindicare." Neque erubescunt palam publiceque profiteri hæreticorum effatum et principium, ex quo tot perversæ oriuntur sententiæ, atque errores. Dictitant enim "Ecclesiasticam potestatem non esse jure divino distinctam et independentem a potestate civili, neque ejusmodi distinctionem, et independentiam servari posse, quin ab Ecclesiæ invadantur et usurpentur essentialia jura potestatis civilis." Atque silentio præterire non possumus eorum audaciam, qui sanam non sustinentes doctrinam contendunt "illis Apostolicæ Sedis judiciis, et decretis, quorum objectum ad bonum generale Ecclesiæ, ejusdemque jura, ac disciplinam spectare declaratur, dummodo fidei morumque dogmata non attingat, posse assensum et obedientiam detrectari absque peccato, et absque ulla catholicæ professionis jactura." Quod

* Clement. XII. "*In eminenti.*" Benedict. XIV. "*Providus Romanorum.*" Pii VII. "*Ecclesiam.*" Leonis XII. "*Quo gravíora.*"

quidem quantopere adversetur catholico dogmati plenæ potestatis Romano Pontifici ab ipso Christo Domino divinitus collatæ universalem pascendi, regendi, et gubernandi Ecclesiam, nemo est qui non clare aperteque videat et intelligat.

In tantur igitur depravatarum opinionum perversitate, Nos Apostolici Nostri officii probe memores, ac de sanctissima nostra religione, de sana doctrina, et animarum salute Nobis divinitus commissa, ac de ipsius humanæ societatis bono maxime solliciti, Apostolicam Nostram vocem iterum extollere existimavimus. Itaque omnes et singulas pravas opiniones ac doctrinas singillatim hisce Litteris commemoratas auctoritate Nostra Apostolica reprobamus, proscribimus atque damnamus, easque ab omnibus Catholicæ Ecclesiæ filiis, veluti reprobatas, proscriptas atque damnatas omnino haberi volumus et mandamus.

At præter ea, optimo scitis, Venerabiles Fratres, hisce, temporibus omnis veritatis justitiæque osores, et acerrimos nostræ religionis hostes, per pestiferos libros, libellos, et ephemerides toto terrarum orbi dispersas populis illudentis, ac malitiose mentientes alias impias quasque disseminare doctrinas. Neque ignoratis, hac etiam nostra ætate, nonnullos reperiri, qui Satanæ spiritu permoti, et incitati eo impietatis devenerunt, ut Dominatorem Dominum Nostrum Jesum Christum negare, ejusque Divinitatem scelerata procacitate oppugnare non paveant. Hic vero haud possumus, quis maximis meritisque laudibus Vos efferamus, Venerabiles Fratres, qui episcopalem vestram vocem contra tantam impietatem omni zelo attollere minime omisistis.

Itaque hisce Nostris Litteris Vos iterum amantissime alloquimur, in solicitudinis Nostræ partem vocati summo Nobis, inter maximas Nostras acerbitates solatio, lætitiæ et consolationi estis propter egregiam, qua præstatis religionem, pietatem, ac propter mirum illum amorem, fidem, et observantiam, qua Nobis et huic Apostolicæ Sedi concordissimis animis obstricti gravissimum episcopale vestrum ministerium strenue ac sedulo implere contenditis. Etenim ab eximio vestro pastorali zelo expectamus, ut, assumentes gladium spiritus, quod est verbum Dei, et comfortati in gratia Domini Nostri Jesu Christi, velitis, ingeminatis studiis, quotidie magis prospicere, ut fideles curæ vestræ concrediti "abstineant ab herbis noxiis, quas Jesus Christus non colit, quia non sunt plantatio Patris." * Atque eisdem fidelibus inculcare nunquam desinite, omnem veram felicitatem in homines ex augusta nostra religione, ejusque doctrina et exercitio redundare, ac beatum esse populum, cujus Dominus Deus ejus. † Docete "Catholicæ Fidei fundamento regna subsistere, ‡ et nihil tam mortiferum,

* S. Ignatius M. ad Philadelph. 3. † Psal. 143.
‡ S. Cælest. Epist. 22 ad Synod. Ephes. apud Const. p. 1200.

tam præceps ad casum, tam expositum ad omnia pericula, si hoc solum nobis putantes posse sufficere, quod liberum arbitrium, cum nasceremur, accepimus, ultra jam a Domino nihil quæramus, id est auctoris nostri obliti, ejus potentiam, ut nos ostendamus liberos, abjuremus. * Atque etiam ne omittatis docere regiam potestatem non ad solum mundi regimen, sed maxime ad Ecclesiæ præsidium esse collatam,† et nihil esse quod civitatum Principibus, et Regibus majori fructui, gloriæque esse possit, quam si, ut sapientissimus fortissimusque alter Prædecessor Noster S. Felix Zenoni Imperatori prescribebat, "Ecclesiam catholicam . . . sinant uti legibus suis, nec libertati ejus quemquam permittant obsistere. . . . Certum est enim, hoc rebus suis esse salutare, ut, cum de causis Dei agatur, juxta ipsius constitutum regiam voluntatem Sacerdotibus Christi studeant subdere, non præferre." ‡

Sed si semper, Venerabiles Fratres, nunc potissimum in tantis Ecclesiæ, civilisque societatis calamitatibus, in tanta adversariorum contra rem catholicam, et hanc Apostolicam Sedem conspiratione tantaque errorum congerie, necesse omnino est, ut adeamus cum fiducia ad thronum gratiæ, ut misericordiam consequamur, et gratiam inveniamus in auxilio opportuno. Quocirca omnium fidelium pietatem excitare existimavimus, ut una Nobiscum Vobisque clementissimum luminum et misericordiarum Patrem ferventissimis humillimisque precibus sine intermissione orent, et obsecrent; et in plenitudine fidei semper confugiant ad Dominum Nostrum Jesum Christum, qui redemit nos Deo in sanguine suo, Ejusque dulcissimum Cor flagrantissimæ erga nos caritatis victimam enixe jugiterque exorent, ut amoris sui vinculis omnia ad seipsum trahat, utque omnes homines, sanctissimo suo amore inflammati, secundum Cor Ejus ambulent digne Deo per omnia placentes, in omni bono opere fructificantes. Cum autem sine dubio gratiores sint Deo hominum preces, si, animis ab omni labe puris ad ipsum accedant, idcirco cœlestes Ecclesiæ thesauros dispensationi Nostræ commissos Christi fidelibus Apostolica liberalitate reserare censuimus, ut iidem fideles, ad veram pietatem vehementius incensi, ac per Pœnitentiæ Sacramentum a peccatorum maculis expiati, fidentius suas preces ad Deum effundant, ejusque misericordiam et gratiam consequantur.

Hisce igitur Litteris auctoritate Nostra Apostolica omnibus et singulis utriusque sexus catholici orbis fidelibus Plenariam Indulgentiam ad instar Jubilæi concedimus intra unius tantum

---

* S. Innocent. I. Epist. 29 ad Episc. Conc. Carthag. apud Const. 891.

† S. Leo Epist. 156, Al. 125.

‡ Pius VII. Epist. Encycl. *Diu satis.* 15 Maii 1800.

mensis spatium usque ad totum futurum annum 1865 et non ultra, a Vobis, Venerabiles Fratres, aliisque legitimis locorum Ordinariis statuendum, eodem prorsus modo et forma, qua ab initio supremi Nostri Pontificatus concessimus per Apostolicas Nostras Litteras in forma Brevis die 20 mensis Novembris anno 1846 datas, et ad universum episcopalem vestrum Ordinem missas, quarum initium "Arcano Divinæ Providentiæ Consilio," et cum omnibus eisdem facultatibus, quæ per ipsas Litteras a Nobis datæ fuerunt. Volumus tamen, ut ea omnia serventur, quæ in commemoratis Litteris præscripta sunt, et ea excipiantur, quæ excepta esse declaravimus. Atque id concedimus, non obstantibus in contrarium facientibus quibuscumque, etiam speciali et individua mentione, ac derogatione dignis. Ut autem omnis dubitatio et difficultas amoveatur, earumdem Litterarum exemplar ad Vos perferri jussimus.

"Rogemus, Venerabiles Fratres, de intimo corde et de tota mente misericordiam Dei, quia et ipse addidit dicens: misericordiam autem meam non dispergam ab eis. Petamus et accipiemus, et si accipiendi mora et tarditas fuerit quoniam graviter offendimus, pulsemus, quia et pulsanti aperietur, si modo pulsant ostium preces, gemitus, et lacrimæ nostræ, quibus insistere et immorari oportet, et si sit unanimis oratio . . . unusquisque oret Deum non pro se tantum, sed pro omnibus fratribus, sicut Dominus orare nos docuit." * Quo vero facilius Deus Nostris Vestrisque, et omnium fidelium precibus, votisque annuat, cum omnifiducia deprecatricem apud Eum adhibeamus Immaculatam sanctissimamque Deiparam Virginem Mariam, quæ cunctas hæreses interemit in universo mundo, quæque omnium nostrum amantissima Mater "tota suavis est . . . ac plena misericordia . . . omnibus sese exorabilem, omnibus clementissimam præbet, omnium necessitates amplissimo quodam miseratur affectu"† atque utpote Regina adstans a dextris Unigeniti Filii Sui Domini Nostri Jesu Christi in vestitu deaurato circumamicta varietate, nihil est, quod ab Eo impetrare non valeat. Suffragia quoque petamus Beatissimi Petri, Apostolorum Principis, et Coapostoli ejus Pauli, omniumque Sanctorum Cælitum, qui, facti jam amici Dei, pervenerunt ad cœlestia regna, et coronata possident palmam, ac de sua immortalitate securi, de nostra sunt salute solliciti.

Denique cœlestium omnium donorum copiam Vobis a Deo ex animo adprecantes singularis Nostræ in Vos caritatis pignus Apostolicam Benedictionem ex intimo corde profectam Vobis

---

* S. Cyprian. Epist. 11.

† S. Bernard. Serm. de Duodecim Prærogativis B. M. V. ex Verbis Apocalyp.

ipsis, Venerabiles Fratres, cunctisque Clericis, Laicisque fidelibus curæ vestræ commissis peramanter impertimus.

Datum Romæ apud S. Petrum die viii. Decembris anno 1864, decimo a Dogmatica Definitione Immaculatæ Conceptionis Deiparæ Virginis Mariæ.

Pontificatus Nostri Anno Decimo-nono.

PIUS P.P. IX.

(No. II.)

SYLLABUS

COMPLECTENS PRÆCIPUOS NOSTRÆ ÆTATIS ERRORES QUI NOTANTUR IN ALLOCUTIONIBUS CONSISTORIALIBUS IN ENCYCLICIS ALIISQUE APOSTOLICIS LITTERIS SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI PII PAPÆ IX.

§ I. Pantheismus, Naturalismus et Rationalismus Absolutus.

I. Nullum supremum, sapientissimum, providentissimumque Numen divinum existit ab hac rerum universitate distinctum, et Deus idem est ac rerum natura et iccirco immutationibus obnoxius, Deusque reapse fit in homine et mundo, atque omnia Deus sunt et ipsissimam Dei habent substantiam; ac una eademque res est Deus cum mundo, et proinde spiritus cum materia, necessitas cum libertate, verum cum falso, bonum cum malo, et justum cum injusto.

Alloc. *Maxima quidem*, 9 Junii 1862.

II. Neganda est omnis Dei actio in homines et mundum.

Alloc. *Maxima quidem*, 9 Junii 1862.

III. Humana ratio, nullo prorsus Dei respectu habito, unicus est veri et falsi, boni et mali arbiter, sibi ipsi est lex et naturalibus suis viribus ad hominum ac populorum bonum curandum sufficit.

Alloc. *Maxima quidem*, 9 Junii 1862.

IV. Omnes religiones veritates ex nativa humanæ rationis vi derivant; hinc ratio est princeps norma qua homo cognitionem omnium cujuscumque generis veritatum assequi possit ac debeat.

Epist. Encycl. *Qui pluribus*, 9 Novembris 1846.

Epist. Encycl. *Singulare quidem*, 17 Martii 1856.

Alloc. *Maxima quidem*, 9 Junii 1862.

V. Divina revelatio est imperfecta et iccirco subjecta continua et indefinito progressui qui humanæ rationis progressioni respondeat.

Epist. Encycl. *Qui pluribus*, 9 Novembris 1846.

Alloc. *Maxima quidem*, 9 Junii 1862.

VI. Christi fides humanæ refragatur rationi; divinaque revelatio non solum nihil prodest verum etiam nocet hominis perfectioni.

Epist. Encycl. *Qui pluribus*, 9 Novembris 1846.

Alloc. *Maxima quidem*, 9 Junii 1862.

VII. Prophetiæ et miracula in Sacris Litteris exposita et narratu sunt poetarum commenta, et Christianæ fidei mysteria philosophicarum investigationum summa; et utriusque Testamenti libris mythica continentur inventa; ipseque Jesus Christus est mythica fictio.

Epist. Encycl. *Qui pluribus*, 9 Novembris 1846.

Alloc. *Maxima quidem*, 9 Junii 1862.

§ II.—Rationalismus Moderatus.

VIII. Quum ratio humana ipsi religioni æquiparetur, iccirco theologicæ disciplinæ perinde ac philosophicæ tractandæ sunt.

Alloc. *Singulari quadam perfusi*, 9 Decembris 1854.

IX. Omnia indiscriminatim dogmata religionis Christianæ sunt objectum naturalis scientiæ seu philosophiæ; et humana ratio historice tantum exculta potest ex suis naturalibus viribus et principiis ad veram de omnibus etiam reconditioribus dogmatibus scientiam pervenire, modo hæc dogmata ipsi rationi tamquam objectum proposita fuerint.

Epist. ad Archiep. Frising. *Gravissimas*, 11 Decembris 1862.

Epist. ad eundem, *Tuas libenter*, 21 Decembris 1863.

X. Quum aliud sit philosophus, aliud philosophia, ille jus et officium habet se submittendi auctoritati, quam veram ipse probaverit; et philosophia neque potest, neque debet ulli sese submittere auctoritati.

Epist. ad Archiep. Frising. *Gravissimas*, 11 Decembris 1862.

Epist. ad eundem, *Tuas libenter*, 21 Decembris 1863.

XI. Ecclesia non solum non debet in philosophiam unquam animadvertere, verum etiam debet ipsius philosophiæ tolerare errores, eisque relinquere ut ipsa se corrigat.

Epist. ad Archiep. Frising. *Gravissimas*, 11 Decembris 1862.

XII. Apostolicæ Sedis, Romanarumque Congregationum Decreta liberum scientiæ progressum impediunt.

Epist. ad Archiep. Frising. *Tuas libenter*, 21 Decembris 1862.

XIII. Methodus et principia, quibus antiqui Doctores Scholastici Theologiam excoluerunt, temporum nostrorum necessitatibus scientiarumque progressui minime congruunt.

Epist. ad Archiep. Frising. *Tuas libenter*, 21 Decembris 1863.

XIV. Philosophia tractanda est, nulla supernaturalis revelationis habita ratione.

Epist. ad Archiep. Frising. *Tuas libenter*, 21 Decembris 1863.

N.B.—Cum rationalismi systemate cohærent maximam partem errores Antonii Gunther, qui damnantur in Epist. ad Card. Archiep. Coloniensem *Eximiam tuam*, 15 Junii 1847, et in Epist. ad Episc. Wratislaviensem *Dolore haud mediocri*, 30 Aprilis 1860.

§ III. Indifferentismus, Latitudinarismus.

XV. Liberum cuique homini est eam amplecti ac profiteri religionem, quam rationis lumine quis ductus veram putaverit.

Litt. Apost. *Multiplices inter*, 10 Juni 1851.

Alloc. *Maxima quidem*, 9 Junii 1862.

XVI. Homines in cujusvis religionis cultu viam æternæ salutis reperire æternamque salutem assequi possunt.

Epist. Encycl. *Qui pluribus*, 9 Novembris 1846.

Alloc. *Ubi primum*, 17 Decembris 1847.

Epist. Encycl. *Singulari quidem*, 17 Martii 1856.

XVII. Saltem bene sperandum est de æterna illorum omnium salute, qui in vera Christi Ecclesia nequaquam versantur.

Alloc. *Singulari quadam*, 9 Decembris 1854.

Epist. Encycl. *Quanto conficiamur*, 17 Augusti 1863.

XVIII. Protestantismus non aliud est quam diversa veræ ejusdem Christianæ religionis forma, in qua æque ac in Ecclesia Catholica Deo placere datum est.

Epist. Encycl. *Noscitis et Nobiscum*, 8 Decembris 1859.

§ IV. Socialismus, Communismus, Societates Clandestinæ, Societates Biblicæ, Societates Clerico-liberales.

Ejusmodi pestes sæpe gravissimisque verborum formulis reprobantur in Epist. Encycl. *Qui pluribus*, 9 Novemb. 1846; in Alloc. *Quibus quantisque*, 20 Aprilis 1849; in Epist. Encycl. *Noscitis et Nobiscum*, 8 Dec. 1849; in Alloc. *Singulari quadam*, 9 Decemb. 1854; in Epist. Encycl. *Quanto conficiamur mœrore*, 10 Augusti 1863.

§ V. Errores de Ecclesia ejusque juribus.

XIX. Ecclesia non est vera perfectaque societas plane libera, nec pollet suis propriis et constantibus juribus sibi a divino suo fundatore collatis, sed civilis potestatis est definire quæ sint Ecclesiæ jura ac limites, intra quos eadem jura exercere queat.

Alloc. *Singulari quadam*, 9 Decembris 1854.

Alloc. *Multus gravibusque*, 17 Decembris 1860.

Alloc. *Maxima quidem*, 9 Junii 1862.

XX. Ecclesiastica potestas suam auctoritatem exercere non debet absque civilis gubernii venia et assensu.

Alloc. *Meminit unusquisque*, 30 Septembris 1861.

XXI. Ecclesia non habet potestatem dogmatice definiendi religionem Catholicæ Ecclesiæ esse unice veram religionem.

Litt. Apost. *Multiplices inter*, 10 Junii 1851.

XXII. Obligatio, qua catholici magistri et scriptores omnino adstringuntur, coarctatur in iis tantum, quæ ab infallibili Ecclesiæ judicio velut fidei dogmata ab omnibus credenda proponuntur.

Epist. ad Archiep. Frising. *Tuas libentur*, 21 Decembris 1863.

XXIII. Romani Pontifices et Concilia Œcumenica a limitibus suæ potestatis recesserunt, jura Principium usurparunt, atque etiam in rebus fidei et morum definiendis errarunt.

Litt. Apost. *Multiplices inter*, 10 Junii 1851.

XXIV. Ecclesia vis inferendæ potestatem non habet, neque potestatem ullam temporalem directam vel indirectam.

Litt. Apost. *Ad apostolicae*, 22 Augusti 1851.

XXV. Præter potestatem episcopatui inhærentem, alia est attributa temporalis potestas a civili imperio vel expresse vel tacite concessa, revocanda propterea, cum libuerit, civili imperio.

Litt. Apost. *Ad apostolicae*, 22 Augusti 1851.

XXVI. Ecclesia non habet nativum ac legitimum jus acquirendi ac possidendi.

Alloc. *Nunquam fore*, 15 Decembris 1856.

Epist. Encycl. *Incredibili*, 17 Septembris 1863.

XXVII. Sacri Ecclesiæ ministri Romanusque Pontifex ab omni rerum temporalium cura ac dominio sunt omnino excludendi.

Alloc. *Maxima quidem*, 9 Junii 1862.

XXVIII. Episcopis, sine Gubernii venia, fas non est vel ipsas apostolicas litteras promulgare.

Alloc. *Nunquam fore*, 15 Decembris 1856.

XXIX. Gratiæ a Romano Pontifice concessæ existimari debent tamquam irritæ, nisi per Gubernium fuerint imploratæ.

Alloc. *Nunquam fore*, 15 Decembris 1856.

XXX. Ecclesiæ et personarum ecclesiasticarum immunitas a jure civili ortum habuit.

Litt. Apost. *Multiplices inter*, 10 Junii 1851.

XXXI. Ecclesiasticum forum pro temporalibus clericorum causis sive civilibus sive criminalibus omnino de medio tollendum est, etiam inconsulta et reclamante Apostolica Sede.

Alloc. *Acerbissimum*, 27 Septembris 1852.

Alloc. *Nunquam fore*, 15 Decembris 1856.

XXXII. Absque ulla naturalis juris et æquitatis violatione potest abrogari personalis immunitas, qua clerici ab onere sub-

eundæ exercendæque militiæ eximuntur; hanc vero abrogationem postulat civilis progressus, maxime in societate ad formam liberioris regiminis constituta.

Epist. ad Episc. Montisregal. *Singularis Nobisque*, 29 Septembris 1864.

XXXIII. Non pertinet unice ad ecclesiasticam jurisdictionis potestatem proprio ac nativo jure dirigere theologicarum rerum doctrinam.

Epist. ad. Archiep. Frising. *Tuas libenter*, 21 Decembris 1863.

XXXIV. Doctrina comparantium Romanum Pontificem Principi libero et agenti in universa Ecclesia, doctrina est quæ medio ævo prævaluit.

Litt. Apost. *Ad apostolicae*, 22 Augusti 1851.

XXXV. Nihil vetat, alicujus Concilii generalis sententia aut universorum populorum facto, summum Pontificatum ab Romano Episcopo, atque Urbe ad alium Episcopum aliamque civitatem transferri.

Litt. Apost. *Ad apostolicae*, 22 Augusti 1851.

XXXVI. Nationalis Concilii definitio nullam aliam admittit disputationem, civilisque administratio rem ad hosce terminos exigere potest.

Litt. Apost. *Ad apostolicae*, 22 Augusti 1851.

XXXVII. Institui possunt Nationales Ecclesiæ ab auctoritate Romani Pontificis subductæ planeque divisæ.

Alloc. *Multis gravibusque*, 17 Decembris 1860.

Alloc. *Jamdudum cernimus*, 18 Martii 1861.

XXXVIII. Divisioni Ecclesiæ in orientalem atque occidentalem nimia Romanorum Pontificum arbitria contulerunt.

Litt. Apost. *Ad Apostolicae*, 22 Augusti 1851.

§ VI.—Errores de Societate Civili tum in se, tum in suis ad Ecclesiam relationibus spectata.

XXXIX. Reipublicæ status, utpote omnium jurium origo et fons jure quodam pollet nullis circumscripto limitibus.

Alloc. *Maxima quidem*, 9 Junii 1862.

XL. Catholicæ Ecclesiæ doctrina humanæ societatis bono et commodis adversatur.

Epist. Encycl. *Qui pluribus*, 9 Novembris 1846.

Alloc. *Quibus quantisque*, 20 Aprilis 1849.

XLI. Civili potestati vel ab infideli imperante exercitæ competit potestas indirecta negativa in sacra; eidem proinde competit nedum jus quod vocant *exequatur*, sed etiam jus *appellationis*, quam nuncupant, *ab abusu*.

Litt. Apost. *Ad apostolicae*, 22 Augusti 1851.

XLII. In conflictu legum utriusque potestatis, jus civile prævalet.

Litt. Apost. *Ad apostolicae*, 22 Augusti 1851.

XLIII. Laica potestas auctoritatem habet rescindendi, declarandi ac faciendi irritas solemnes conventiones (vulgo *Concordata*) super usu jurium ad ecclesiasticam immunitatem pertinentium cum Sede Apostolica initas, sine hujus consensu, immo et ea reclamante.

Alloc. *In Consistoriali*, 1 Novembris 1850.

Alloc. *Multis gravibusque*, 16 Decembris 1860.

XLIV. Civilis auctoritas potest se immiscere rebus quæ ad religionem, mores et regimen spirituale pertinent. Hinc potest de instructionibus judicare, quas Ecclesiæ pastores ad conscientiarum normam pro suo munere obeunt, quin etiam potest de divinorum sacramentorum administratione et dispositionibus ad ea suspicienda necessariis decernere.

Alloc. *In Consistoriali*, 1 Novembris 1850.

Alloc. *Maxima quidem*, 9 Junii 1862.

XLV. Totem scholarum publicarum regimen, in quibus juventus Christianæ alicujus Reipublicæ instituitur, episcopalibus dumtaxat, seminariis aliqua ratione exceptis, potest ac debet attribui auctoritati civili, et ita quidem attribui, ut nullum alii cuicumque auctoritati recognoscatur jus immiscendi se in disciplina scholarum, in regimini studiorum, in graduum collatione, in delectu aut approbatione magistrorum.

Alloc. *In Consistoriali*, 1 Novembris 1850.

Alloc. *Quibus luctuosissimis*, 5 Septembris 1851.

XLVI. Immo in ipsis clericorum seminariis methodus studiorum adhibenda civili auctoritati subjicitur.

Alloc. *Nunquam fore*, 15 Decembris 1856.

XLVII. Postulat optima civilis societatis ratio, ut populares scholæ, quæ patent omnibus cujusque e populo-classis pueris, ac publica universim Instituta, quæ litteris severioribusque disciplinis tradendis, et educationi juventutis curandæ sunt destinata, eximantur ab omni Ecclesiæ authoritate, moderatrice vi et ingerentia, plenoque civilis ac politicæ auctoritatis arbitrio subjiciantur ad imperantium placita et ad communium ætatis opinionum amussim.

Epist. ad Archiep. Friburg. *Quum non sine*, 14 Julii 1864.

XLVIII. Catholicis viris probari potest ea juventutis institutsendæ ratio quæ sit a catholica fide et ab Ecclesiæ potestate sejuncta, quæque rerum dumtaxat naturalium scientiam ac terrenæ socialis vitæ fines tantummodo vel saltem primarium spectet.

Epist ad Archiep. Friburg. *Quum non sine*, 14 Julii 1864.

XLIX. Civilis auctoritas potest impedire quominus sacrorum Antistites et fideles populi cum Romano Pontifice libere ac mutuo communicent.

Alloc. *Maxima quidem*, 9 Junii 1862.

L. Laica auctoritas habet per se jus præsentandi episcopos et potest ab illis exigere ut ineat diœcesium procurationem antequam

ipsi canonicam a S. Sede institutionem et Apostolicas Litteras accipiant.

Alloc. *Nunquam fore*, 15 Decembris 1856.

LI. Immo laicum Gubernium habet jus deponendi ab exercitio pastoralis ministerii episcopos, neque tenetur obedire Romano Pontifici in iis quæ episcopatum et episcoporum respiciunt institutionem.

Litt. Apost. *Multiplices inter*, 10 Junii 1851.

Alloc. *Acerbissimum*, 27 Septembris 1852.

LII. Gubernium potest suo jure immutare ætatem ab Ecclesia præscriptam pro religiosa tam mulierum quam virorum professione, omnibusque religiosis familiis indicere, ut neminem sine suo permissu ad solemnia vota nuncupanda admittant.

Alloc. *Nunquam fore*, 15 Decembris 1856.

LIII. Abrogandæ sunt leges quæ ad religiosarum familiarum statum tutandum, earumque jura et officia pertinent; immo potest civile Gubernium iis omnibus auxilium præstare, qui a suscepto religiosæ vitæ instituto deficere ac solemnia vota frangere velint; pariterque potest, Religiosas easdem Familias perinde ac Collegiatas Ecclesias et beneficia simplicia etiam juris patronatus penitus extinguere, illorumque bona et reditus civilis potestatis administrationi et arbitrio subjicere et vindicare.

Alloc. *Acerbissimum*, 27 Septembris 1852.

Alloc. *Probe memineritis*, 22 Januarii 1855.

Alloc. *Cum saepe*, 26 Julii 1855.

LIV. Reges et Principes non solum ab Ecclesiæ jurisdictione eximuntur, verum etiam in quæstionibus jurisdictionis dirimendis superiores sunt Ecclesia.

Litt. Apost. *Multiplices inter*, 10 Junii 1851.

LV. Ecclesia a Statu, Statusque ab Ecclesia sejungendus est.

Alloc. *Acerbissimum*, 27 Septembris 1852.

§ VII. Errores de Ethica Naturali et Christiana.

LVI. Morum leges divina haud egent sanctione, minimeque opus est ut humanæ leges ad naturæ jus conformentur aut obligandi vim a Deo accipiant.

Alloc. *Maxima quidem*, 9 Julii 1862.

LVII. Philosophicarum rerum morumque scientia, itemque civiles leges possunt et debent a divina et ecclesiastica auctoritate declinare.

Alloc. *Maxima quidem*, 9 Julii 1862.

LVIII. Aliæ vires non sunt agnoscendæ nisi illæ quæ in materia positæ sunt, et omnis morum disciplina honestasque collocari debet in cumulandis et augendis quovis modo divitiis ac in voluptatibus explendis.

Alloc. *Maxima quidem*, 9 Julii 1862.

Epist. Encycl. *Quanto conficiamur*, 10 Augusti 1863.

LIX. Jus in materiali facto consistit, et omnia hominum officia sunt nomen inane, et omnia humana facta juris vim habent.

Alloc. *Maxima quidem*, 9 Julii 1862.

LX. Auctoritas nihil aliud est nisi numeri et materialium virium summa.

Alloc. *Maxima quidem*, 9 Julii 1862.

LXI. Fortunata facti injustitia nullum juris sanctitati detrimentum affert.

Alloc. *Jamdudum cernimus*, 18 Martii 1861.

LXII. Proclamandum est et observandum principium quod vocant de, *non-interventu*.

Alloc. *Novos et ante*, 28 Septembris 1860.

LXIII. Legitimis principibus obedientiam detrectare, immo et rebellare licet.

Epist. Encycl. *Qui pluribus*, 9 Novembris 1846.

Alloc. *Quisque vestrum*, 4 Octobris 1847.

Epist. Encycl. *Noscitis et Nobiscum*, 8 Decembris 1849.

Litt. Apost. *Cum catholica*, 26 Martii 1860.

LXIV. Tum cujusque sanctissimi juramenti violatio, tum quælibet scelesta flagitiosaque actio sempiternæ legi repugnans, non solum haud est improbanda, verum etiam omnino licita, summisque laudibus efferenda, quando id pro patriæ amore agatur.

Alloc. *Quibus quantisque*, 20 Aprilis 1849.

§ VIII. Errores de Matrimonio Christiano.

LXV. Nulla ratione ferri potest, Christum evexisse matrimonium ad dignitatem sacramenti.

Litt. Apost. *Ad apostolicae*, 22 Augusti 1851.

LXVI. Matrimonii sacramentum non est nisi quid contractui accessorium ab eoque separabile, ipsumque sacramentum in una tantum nuptiali benedictione situm est.

Litt. Apost. *Ad apostolicae*, 22 Augusti 1851.

LXVII. Jure naturæ matrimonii vinculum non est indissolubile, et variis casibus divortium proprie dictum auctoritate civili sanciri potest.

Litt. Apost. *Ad apostolicae*, 22 Augusti 1851.

Alloc. *Acerbissimum*, 27 Septembris 1852.

LXVIII. Ecclesia non habet potestatem impedimenta matrimonium dirimentia inducendi sed ea potestas civili auctoritati competit, a qua impedimenta existentia tollenda sunt.

Litt. Apost. *Multiplices inter*, 10 Junii 1851.

LXIX. Ecclesia sequioribus sæculis dirimentia impedimenta inducere cœpit, non jure proprio, sed illo jure usa quod a civili potestate mutuata erat.

Litt. Apost. *Ad apostolicae*, 22 Augusti 1851.

LXX. Tridentini Canones qui anathematis censuram illis inferunt qui facultatem impedimenta dirimentia inducendi Ecclesiæ negare audeant, vel non sunt dogmatici vel de hac mutuata potestate intelligendi sunt.

Litt. Apost. *Ad apostolicae*, 22 Augusti 1851.

LXXI. Tridentini forma sub infirmitatis pœna non obligat, ubi lex civilis aliam formam præstituat et velit hac nova forma interveniente matrimonium valere.

Litt. Apost. *Ad apostolicae*, 22 Augusti 1851.

LXXII. Bonifacius VIII. votum castitatis in ordinatione emissum nuptias nullas reddere primus asseruit.

Litt. Apost. *Ad apostolicae*, 22 Augusti 1851.

LXXIII. Vi contractus mere civilis potest inter Christianos constare veri nominis matrimonium; falsumque est, aut contractum matrimonii inter Christianos semper esse sacramentum, aut nullum esse contractum, si sacramentum excludatur.

Litt. Apost. *Ad apostolicae*, 22 Augusti 1851.

Lettera di S. S. PIO IX. al Re di Sardegna, 9 Settembre 1852.

Alloc. *Acerbissimum*, 27 Septembris 1852.

Alloc. *Multis gravibusque*, 17 Decembris 1860.

LXXIV. Causæ matrimoniales et sponsalia suapte natura ad forum civilem pertinent.

Litt. Apost. *Ad apostolicae*, 22 Augusti 1851.

Alloc. *Acerbissimum*, 27 Septembris 1852.

N.B.—Huc facere possunt duo alii errores de clericorum cœlibatu abolendo et de statu matrimonii statui virginitatis anteferendo. Confodiuntur, prior in Epist. Encycl. *Qui pluribus*, 9 Novembris 1846, posterior in Litteris Apost. *Multiplices inter*, 10 Junii 1851.

§ IX. Errores de Civili Romani Pontificis Principatu.

LXXV. De temporalis regni cum spirituali compatibilitate disputant inter se Christianæ et Catholicæ Ecclesiæ filii.

Litt. Apost. *Ad apostolicae*, 22 Augusti 1851.

LXXVI. Abrogatio civilis imperii quo Apostolica Sedes potitur, ad Ecclesiæ libertatem felicitatemque vel maxime conduceret.

Alloc. *Quibus quantisque*, 20 Aprilis 1849.

N.B.—Præter hos errores explicite notatos, alii complures implicite reprobantur proposita et asserta doctrina, quam catholici omnes firmissime retinere debeant, de civili Romani Pontificis principatu. Ejusmodi doctrina luculenter traditur in Alloc. *Quibus quantisque*, 20 Aprilis 1849; in Alloc. *Si semper antea*, 20 Maii 1850; in Litt. Apost. *Cum Catholica Ecclesia*, 26 Martii 1860;

in Alloc. *Novos*, 28 Sept. 1860; in Alloc. *Jamdudum*, 18 Mart 1861; in Alloc. *Maxima quidem*, 9 Junii 1862.

§ X. Errores qui ad Liberalismum Hodiernum referuntur.

LXXVII. Ætate hac nostra non amplius expedit, religionem catholicam haberi tamquam unicam status religionem, ceteris quibuscumque cultibus exclusis.

Alloc. *Nemo vestrum*, 26 Julii 1855.

LXXVIII. Hinc laudabileter in quibusdam Catholici nominis regionibus lege cautum est, ut hominibus illuc immigrantibus liceat publicum proprii cujusque cultus exercitium habere.

Alloc. *Acerbissimum*, 27 Septembris 1852.

LXXIX. Enimvero falsum est, civilem cujusque cultus libertatem, itemque plenam potestatem omnibus attributam quælibet opiniones cogitationesque palam publiceque manifestandi conducere ad populorum mores animosque facilius corrumpendos ac indifferentismi pestem propagandam.

Alloc. *Nunquam fore*, 15 Decembris 1856.

LXXX. Romanus Pontifex potest ac debet cum progressu, cum liberalismo et cum recenti civilitate sese reconciliare et componere.

Alloc. *Jamdudum cernimus*, 18 Martii 1861.

ENGLISH TRANSLATION,

WITH THE EIGHTY ERRORS IN NEGATIVE PROPOSITIONS BY A ROMAN CATHOLIC,* AND IN AFFIRMATIVE PROPOSITIONS BY A PROTESTANT.

To Our Venerable Brothers, the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, and Bishops of the Universal Church, having Grace and Communion of the Apostolic See,

PIUS P.P. IX.,

Health and Apostolic Benediction.

It is well-known unto all men, and especially to You, Venerable Brothers, with what great care and pastoral vigilance Our Predecessors, the Roman Pontiffs, have discharged the Office entrusted by Christ Our Lord to them in the person of the Most Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles and have unremittingly fulfilled the

* This English Translation of the Encyclical Letter, with the Syllabus *in Negative Propositions*, is taken from that published in *The Weekly Register*, and at *The Weekly Register* Office, 32 Brydges Street, Strand, London.

duty of feeding the lambs and sheep, and have diligently nourished the Lord's entire flock with the words of faith, imbued it with salutary doctrine, and guarded it from poisoned pastures. And those Our Predecessors, who were the assertors and champions of the august Catholic Religion, of truth and of justice, being as they were chiefly solicitous for the salvation of souls, held nothing to be of so great importance as the duty of exposing and condemning, in their most wise Letters and Constitutions, all heresies and errors which are hostile to moral honesty and to the eternal salvation of mankind, and which have frequently stirred up terrible commotions and have damaged both the Christian and civil commonwealths in a disastrous manner. Wherefore those Our Predecessors have with Apostolic fortitude continually resisted the nefarious attempts of unjust men, of those who, like raging waves of the sea, foaming forth their own confusion, and promising liberty whilst they are the slaves of corruption, endeavoured by their false opinions and most pernicious writings to overthrow the foundations of the Catholic religion and of civil society, to abolish all virtue and justice, to deprave the souls and minds of all men, and especially to pervert inexperienced youth from uprightness of morals, to corrupt them miserably, to lead them into snares of error, and finally to tear them from the bosom of the Catholic Church.

And now, Venerable Brothers, as is also very well known to You, scarcely had We (by the secret dispensation of Divine Providence, certainly by no merit of Our own) been called to this Chair of Peter, when We, to the extreme grief of Our soul, beheld a horrible tempest stirred up by so many erroneous opinions, and the dreadful, and never-enough-to-be-lamented mischiefs which redound to Christian people from such errors: and We, then, in discharge of Our Apostolic Ministerial Office, imitating the example of Our illustrious Predecessors, raised Our voice, and in several published Encyclical Letters, and in Allocutions delivered in Consistory, and in other Apostolical Letters, We condemned the prominent most grievous errors of the age, and We stirred up Your excellent episcopal vigilance, and again and again did We admonish and exhort all the sons of the Catholic Church who are most dear to Us, that they should abhor and shun all the said errors as they would the contagion of a fatal pestilence. Especially in Our first Encyclical Letter, written to You on the 9th of November, *anno* 1846, and in two Allocutions, one of which was delivered by Us in Consistory on the 9th of December, *anno* 1854, and the other on the 9th of June, *anno* 1862, We condemned the monstrous and portentous opinions which prevail especially in the present age, to the very great loss of souls, and even to the detriment of civil society; and which are in the highest degree hostile, not only to the Catholic Church, and to her salutary doctrine and venerable

laws, but also to the everlasting law of nature engraven by God upon the hearts of all men, and to right reason; and out of which almost all other errors originate.

Now, although hitherto We have not omitted to denounce and reprove the chief errors of this kind, yet the cause of the Catholic Church and the salvation of souls committed to Us by God, and even the interests of human society absolutely demand, that once again We should stir up Your pastoral solicitude to drive away other erroneous opinions which flow from those errors above specified, as their source. These false and perverse opinions are so much the more detestable by how much they have chiefly for their object to hinder and banish that salutary influence which the Catholic Church, by the institution and command of her Divine Author, ought freely to exercise, even to the consummation of the world—not only over individual men, but over nations and sovereigns—and to abolish that mutual co-operation and agreement of counsels between the Priesthood and Governments which has always been propitious and conducive to the welfare both of Church and State, (Gregory XVI. Encyclical, 13 August 1832.) You are well aware that, at this time, there are not a few who apply to civil society the impious and absurd principle of *naturalism*, as they term it, and dare to teach that "the welfare of the State and political and social progress require that human society should be constituted and governed irrespective of religion, which is to be treated just as if it did not exist, or as if no real difference existed between true and false religions." Contrary to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures, of the Church, and of the Holy Fathers, these persons do not hesitate to assert, that "the best condition of human society is that wherein no duty is recognised by the Government of correcting by enacted penalties the violators of the Catholic Religion, except when the maintenance of the public peace requires it." *From this totally false notion of social government, they fear not to uphold that erroneous opinion most pernicious to the Catholic Church, and to the salvation of souls, which was called by Our Predecessor Gregory XVI. (lately quoted) the insanity (Encycl.* 13 *August* 1832) (*deliramentum*), *namely, that "liberty of conscience and of worship is the right of every man: and that this right ought, in every well-governed State, to be proclaimed and asserted by the law; and that the citizens possess the right of being unrestrained in the exercise of every kind of liberty, by any law, ecclesiastical or civil, so that they are authorised to publish and put forward openly, all their ideas whatsoever, either by speaking, in print, or by any other method."** But whilst these men make these rash assertions, they

* Here the Pope condemns *in toto* the truth that "Liberty of conscience and of worship is the right of every man." And yet Romish agitators now raise the cry of religious liberty in Britain!

do not reflect or consider that they preach the liberty of perdition (St Augustine, Epistle 105, Al. 166), and that, "if it is always free to human arguments to discuss, men will never be wanting who will dare to resist the truth and to rely upon the loquacity of human wisdom, when we know from the command of Our Lord Jesus Christ how faith and Christian wisdom ought to avoid this most mischievous vanity," (St Leo, Epistle 164, Al. 133, sec. 2, Boll. ed.)

And since religion has been banished from civil government; since the teaching and authority of Divine revelation have been repudiated, the idea inseparable therefrom of justice and human right is obscured by darkness, and lost, and in place of true justice and legitimate right, material force is substituted: whence it appears why some, entirely neglecting and slighting the most certain principles of sound reason, dare to proclaim "that the will of the people, manifested by public opinion (as they call it), or by other means, constitutes a supreme law independent of all Divine and human right; and that, in the political order, accomplished facts, by the mere fact of their having been accomplished, have the force of right." But who does not plainly see and understand that human society, released from the ties of religion and true justice, can have no other purpose than to compass its own ends, and to amass riches, and can follow no other law in its actions than the indomitable wickedness of a heart given up to the service of its selfish pleasures and interests? For this reason also these same men persecute with such bitter hatred the Religious Orders who have deserved so well of religion, civil society, and letters; they loudly declare that the Orders have no right to exist, and, in so doing, make common cause with the falsehoods of the heretics. For, as was most wisely taught by Our Predecessor of illustrious memory, Pius VI., "the abolition of Religious Orders injures the state of public profession of the Evangelical counsels; injures a mode of life recommended by the Church as in conformity with Apostolical doctrine; does wrong to the illustrious founders whom we venerate upon our altars, and *who constituted these societies under the inspiration of God*," (Epistle to Cardinal de la Rochefoucald, March 10, 1791.) And these same persons also impiously pretend that citizens should be deprived of the liberty of publicly bestowing on the Church their alms for the sake of Christian charity, and that the law forbidding "servile labour on account of Divine worship" upon certain fixed days should be abolished, upon the most fallacious pretext that such liberty and such law are con-

---

Under this pretence, O'Connell and his party found their way to the Senate. What Rome means by religious liberty, when she speaks of it approvingly, is the power of carrying out her own intolerant system, and the destruction of the liberty of others.

trary to the principles of political economy. Not content with abolishing religion in public society, they desire further to banish it from families and private life. Teaching and professing those most fatal errors of Socialism and Communism,* they declare that "domestic society or the family derives all its reason of existence solely from civil law, whence it is to be concluded that from civil law descend and depend all the rights of parents over their children, and, above all, the right of instructing and educating them." By such impious opinions and machinations do these most false teachers endeavour to eliminate the salutary teaching and influence of the Catholic Church from the instruction and education of youth, and to miserably infect and deprave, by every pernicious error and vice, the tender and pliant mind of youth. All those who endeavour to throw into confusion both religious and political affairs, to destroy the good order of society, and to annihilate all Divine and human rights, have always exerted all their criminal schemes, attention, and efforts upon the manner in which they might, above all, deprave and delude unthinking youth, as We have already shown: it is upon the corruption of youth that they place all their hopes. Thus they never cease to attack by every method the Clergy, both secular and regular, from whom, as testify to us in so conspicuous a manner the most certain records of history, such considerable benefits have been bestowed in abundance upon Christian and civil society and upon the republic of letters; asserting of the Clergy in general that they are the enemies of the useful sciences, of progress, and of civilisation, and that they ought to be deprived of all participation in the work of teaching and training the young.

Others, reviving the depraved fictions of innovators, errors many times condemned, presume with extraordinary impudence, to subordinate the authority of the Church and of this Apostolic See, conferred upon it by Christ Our Lord, to the judgment of civil authority, and to deny all the rights of this same Church and this See with regard to those things which appertain to the secular order. For these persons do not blush to affirm "that the laws of the Church do not bind the conscience if they are not promulgated by the civil power; that the acts and decrees of the Roman Pontiffs concerning religion and the Church require the sanction and approbation, or at least the assent, of the civil power; and that the Apostolic Constitutions (Clement XII., Benedict XIV., Pius VII., Leo XII.) condemning secret societies, whether these exact or do not exact an oath of secrecy, and branding with anathema their followers and partisans, have no force in those countries of the world where such associations are tolerated by the civil Government." It is likewise affirmed "that the excommunications

* The Pope craftily comprises under one sweeping censure infidelity and truth.

launched by the Council of Trent and the Roman Pontiffs against those who invade and usurp the possessions of the Church and its rights, strive, by confounding the spiritual and temporal orders, to attain solely a mere earthly end; that the Church can decide nothing which may bind the consciences of the faithful in the temporal order of things; *that the right of the Church is not competent to restrain with temporal penalties the violaters of her laws;** and that it is in accordance with the principles of theology and of public law for the civil Government to appropriate property possessed by the churches, the Religious Orders, and other pious establishments." And they have no shame in avowing openly and publicly the heretical statement and principle from which has emanated so many errors and perverse opinions, "that the ecclesiastical power is not by the law of God made distinct from and independent of the civil power, and that no distinction, no independence of this kind can be maintained without the Church invading and usurping the essential rights of the civil power." Neither can We pass over in silence the audacity of those who, not enduring sound doctrine, assert that "the judgments and decrees of the Holy See, the object of which is declared to concern the general welfare of the Church, its rights, and its discipline, do not claim acquiescence and obedience under pain of sin and loss of the Catholic profession, if they do not treat of the dogmas of faith and of morals."

How contrary is this doctrine to the Catholic dogma of the plenary power divinely conferred on the Sovereign Pontiff by Our Lord Jesus Christ, to guide, to supervise, and govern the Universal Church, no one can fail to see and understand clearly and evidently.

Amid so great a perversity of depraved opinions, We, remembering Our Apostolic duty, and solicitous before all things for Our most holy religion, for sound doctrine, for the salvation of the souls confided to Us, and for the welfare of human society itself, have considered the moment opportune to raise anew our Apostolic voice. Therefore do We, by Our Apostolic authority, reprobate, denounce, and condemn generally and particularly all the evil opinions and doctrines specially mentioned in this Letter, and we wish that they may be held as reprobated, denounced, and condemned by all the children of the Catholic Church.

But you know further, Venerable Brothers, that in our time the haters of all truth and justice and violent enemies of our religion, have spread abroad other impious doctrines by means of pestilent books, pamphlets, and journals which, distributed over the surface of the earth, deceive the people and wickedly lie. You are not ignorant that in our day men are found who, animated and excited

* Here he claims for the Church the right to *enforce* its claims!

by the spirit of Satan, have arrived at that excess of impiety as not to fear to deny Our Lord and Master Jesus Christ, and to attack His Divinity with scandalous persistence. And here We cannot abstain from awarding You well-merited praise, Venerable Brothers, for all the care and zeal with which You have raised Your episcopal voice against so great an impiety.

And therefore in this present Letter, We speak to You with all affection, to You who, called to partake Our cares, are Our greatest support in the midst of Our very great grief, Our joy and Our consolation, by reason of the excellent piety of which You give proof in maintaining religion, and the marvellous love, faith, and discipline, with which, united by the strongest and most affectionate ties to Us and this Apostolic See, You strive valiantly and accurately to fulfil Your most weighty episcopal ministry. We do then expect from Your excellent pastoral zeal that, taking the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God, and strengthened by the grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ, You will watch with redoubled care, that the faithful committed to Your charge "abstain from evil pasturage, which Jesus Christ doth not till, because His Father hath not planted it," (St Ignac. M. ad Philadelph.; St Leo, Epist. 156, Al. 125.) Never cease, then, to inculcate on the faithful that all true happiness for mankind proceeds from Our august religion, from its doctrine and practice, and that that people is happy who have the Lord for their God, (Psalm 143.) Teach them "that kingdoms rest upon the foundations of the Catholic faith (St Celest., Epist. 22 ad Syn. Eph.), and that nothing is so deadly, nothing so certain to engender every ill, nothing so exposed to danger, as for men to believe that they stand in need of nothing else than the free will which we received at birth, if we ask nothing further from the Lord—that is to say, if, forgetting our Author, we abjure His power to show that we are free." And do not omit to teach "that the Royal power has been established not only to exercise the government of the world, but, above all, for the protection of the Church (St Leo, Epist. 156, Al. 125), and that there is nothing more profitable and more glorious for *the Sovereigns of States and Kings than to leave the Catholic Church to exercise its laws, and not to permit any to curtail its liberty*;"* as Our most wise and courageous Predecessor, St Felix, wrote to the Emperor Zeno, "It is certain that it is advantageous for Sovereigns, when the cause of God is in question, *to submit their Royal will* according to His ordinance, *to the Priests of Jesus Christ, and not to prefer it before them*," (Pius VII. Epist. Encycl. *Diu satis*, 15th May 1800.)

* That is, in plain terms, the liberty of the Church of Rome to take away the liberty of others, is not to be curtailed!

And if always, so especially at present, is it Our duty, Venerable Brothers, in the midst of the numerous calamities of the Church and of civil society, in view of the terrible conspiracy of our adversaries against the Catholic Church and this Apostolic See, and the great accumulation of errors, it is before all things necessary to go with faith to the Throne of Grace to obtain mercy and find grace in timely aid. We have therefore judged it right to excite the piety of all the faithful in order that with Us and with You all, they may pray without ceasing to the Father of lights and of mercies, supplicating and beseeching Him fervently and humbly, in order also in the plenitude of their faith they may seek refuge in our Lord Jesus Christ who has redeemed us to God with His blood, that by their earnest and continual prayers, they may obtain from that most dear Heart, victim of burning charity for us, that it would draw all by the bonds of His love, and that all men, being inflamed by His holy love, may live according to His heart, pleased with God in all things, and being fruitful in all good works.

But, as there is no doubt that the prayers most agreeable to God are those of the men who approach Him with a heart pure from all stain, We have thought it good to open to Christians, with Apostolic liberality, the heavenly treasures of the Church confided to Our dispensation, so that the faithful, more strongly drawn towards true piety and purified from the stain of their sins by the Sacrament of Penance, may more confidently offer up their prayers to God and obtain His mercy and grace.

By these Letters emanating from Our Apostolic authority, We grant to all and each of the faithful of both sexes throughout the Catholic world a Plenary Indulgence in the manner of a Jubilee, during one month, up to the end of the coming year 1865, and not longer, to be carried into effect by You, Venerable Brethren, and the other legitimate local Ordinaries, in the form and manner laid down at the commencement of Our Sovereign Pontificate by Our Apostolical Letters, in form of a Brief, dated the 20th of November, *anno* 1846, and sent to the whole Episcopate of the world, commencing with the words, "*Arcano Divinæ Providentiæ Consilio*," and with the faculties given by Us in those same Letters. We desire, however, that all the prescriptions of Our Letters should be observed, saving the exceptions We have declared are to be made. And We have granted this, notwithstanding all which might make to the contrary, even those worthy of special and individual mention and derogation; and, in order that every doubt and difficulty may be removed, We have ordered that copies of those Letters should be again forwarded to You.

"Let us implore, Venerable Brethren, from our inmost hearts, and with all our souls, the mercy of God He has encouraged us

so to do, by saying:—'I will not withdraw my mercy from them. Let us ask and we shall receive; and if there is slowness or delay in its reception, because we have grievously offended, let us knock, because to him that knocketh it shall be opened; if our prayers, groans, and tears, in which we must persist and be obstinate, knock at the door: and if our prayers be united; let each one pray to God, not for himself alone, but for all his brethren, as the Lord hath taught us to pray," (St Cyprian, Epistle 11.) But, in order that God may accede more easily to Our and Your prayers, and to those of all His faithful servants, let us employ in all confidence *as our Mediatrix with Him the Virgin Mary, Mother of God, who "has destroyed all heresies throughout the world, and who, the most loving Mother of us all, is very gracious . . . and full of mercy . . .* allows herself to be entreated by all, shows herself most clement towards all, and takes under her pitying care all our necessities with a most ample affection," (*St Bernard, Germ. de Duodecim Prærogativis B. M. V. in verbis Apocalyp.*), and who, "sitting as queen upon the right hand of her only begotten Son Our Lord Jesus Christ in a golden vestment, clothed around with various adornments," *there is nothing which she cannot obtain from Him.**
Let us implore also the intervention of the Blessed Peter, Chief of the Apostles, and of his co-Apostle Paul, and of all those Saints of Heaven, who, having already become the friends of God, have been admitted into the celestial kingdom, where they are crowned and bear palms, and who, henceforth certain of their own immortality, are solicitous for our salvation.

In conclusion, We ask of God from Our inmost soul the abundance of His celestial benefits for You, and We bestow upon You, Venerable Brethren, and upon all faithful Clergy and Laity committed to Your care, Our Apostolic Benediction from the most loving depths of Our heart, in token of Our charity towards You.

PIUS P.P. IX.

Given at Rome from St Peter's, this 8th of December 1864, the tenth anniversary of the Dogmatic Definition of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, Mother of God, in the nineteenth year of Our Pontificate.

---

* What gross idolatry! What an insult to the Saviour, who is "more willing to hear than we to pray!"

SYLLABUS

OF THE PRINCIPAL ERRORS OF OUR TIME, WHICH ARE STIGMATISED IN THE CONSISTORIAL ALLOCUTIONS, ENCYCLICAL AND OTHER APOSTOLICAL LETTERS OF OUR MOST HOLY LORD, POPE PIUS IX.

In the Negative Form.

§ I.—PANTHEISM, NATURALISM, AND RATIONALISM ABSOLUTE.

1. There exists no Divine Power, Supreme Being, Wisdom and Providence, distinct from the universe, and God is none other than nature, and is therefore mutable; in effect, God is produced in man and in the world, and all things are God and have the very substance of God. God is, therefore, one and the same thing with the world, and thence mind is the same thing with matter, necessity with liberty, true with false, good with evil, justice with injustice.

2. All action of God upon man and the world is to be denied.—(All. "Maxima quidem," June 9, 1862.)

3. Human reason, without any regard to God, is the sole arbiter of truth and falsehood, of good and evil; it is its own law to itself, and suffices by its natural force to secure the welfare of men and of nations.

4. All the truths of religion are derived from the innate strength of human reason, whence reason is the master rule by which man can and ought to arrive at the knowledge of all truths of every kind.

In the Affirmative Form.

§ I.—PROPOSITIONS OPPOSED TO THE ERRORS OF "PANTHEISM, NATURALISM, AND ABSOLUTE RATIONALISM."

1. There exists a Divine Power, Supreme Being, Wisdom and Providence, distinct from the universe, and God is another being than nature, and is therefore immutable.

It is false that God, in effect (reapse), is simply produced or developed in man and the world, and that all things are God, and have the very substance of God.

God therefore is not the same being with the world [of matter], and thence mind is not the same thing with matter, necessity with liberty, the true with the false, good with evil, justice with injustice.

2. The agency of God in man and the world is not to be denied, but maintained.

3. Only with a due regard to God [or revelation as a guide] is human reason a sufficient arbiter of truth and falsehood, or of good and evil.

Human reason is not a law to itself, and cannot, by its natural powers, secure the welfare either of individuals or of nations.

4. The truths of religion are not all derived from the inherent strength of human reason, and hence [or because of this exception in the case of religious truth] it is false that reason is the master-rule by which man can or ought to arrive at the knowledge of all truths of every kind.

5. Divine revelation is imperfect, and, therefore, subject to a continual and indefinite progress which corresponds with the progress of human reason.[5]

6. Christian faith is in opposition to human reason, and divine revelation not only does not benefit, but even injures the perfection of man.

7. The prophecies and miracles told and narrated in the Sacred Scriptures are the fictions of poets, and the mysteries of the Christian faith are the result of philosophical investigations. In the books of the two Testaments there are contained mythical inventions, and Jesus Christ is Himself a mythical fiction.

—Rationalism Moderate.

8. As human reason is placed on a level with religion, so theological systems must be treated in the same manner as philosophical ones.

9. All the dogmas of the Christian religion are, without exception, the object of natural science or philosophy; and human reason, instructed solely by history, is able by its own natural strength and principles to arrive at the true knowledge of even the most abstruse dogmas, such dogmas being proposed as subject-matter for the reason.

10. As the philosopher is one thing and philosophy is another, so it is the right and duty of the

5. Divine revelation is perfect, and, therefore, it is not subject to continual and indefinite progress in order to correspond with the progress of human reason.[5]

6. The Christian faith (*i.e.* doctrine) presents no opposition to human reason, and divine revelation not only elevates, but also promotes the perfection of man.

7. No prophecies or miracles exhibited and recounted in the Sacred Scriptures are (as represented by the condemned propositions) the fictions of the poets.

No mystery of the Christian faith is the product of philosophical investigation.

Neither of the books of the two Testaments contain invented myths; nor is Jesus Christ Himself a mythical fiction [a fabulous personage].

§ 2.—Propositions opposed to the Errors of "Moderate Rationalism."

8. Since human reason is unequal to [the investigation of] religion, therefore theological questions cannot be treated as philosophical ones.

9. It is false that the dogmas of the Christian religion are all objects [matters of inquiry] of natural science or philosophy; and that, such dogmas being proposed as objective to reason, human reason, instructed solely by history, and by its own natural powers and principles, can arrive at the knowledge of even the most abstruse dogmas.

10. Whereas the philosopher is one thing and philosophy another, not only is it the right and

[5] This proposition is conspicuously opposed to the new doctrine of Development, as broached by Dr Newman and others—a doctrine which directly imports that "Divine Revelation," as delivered by the sacred writers, is *not* perfect, and, therefore, *is* subject to continual and indefinite progress. "Development," however, is not an expansion corresponding with the progress of human nature, but with the accumulating corruptions of the Papacy.

philosopher to submit himself to the authority which he shall have recognised as true; but philosophy neither can nor ought to submit to any authority.[10]

11. The Church not only ought never to animadvert upon philosophy, but ought to tolerate the errors of philosophy, leaving to philosophy the care of their correction.[11]

12. The decrees of the Apostolic See and of the Roman Congregations fetter the free progress of science.[12]

13. The method and principles by which the old scholastic Doctors cultivated theology are no longer suitable to the demands of the age and the progress of science.

14. Philosophy must be treated of without any account being taken of supernatural revelation. —(Id., ibid.)

N.B.—To the rationalistic system belong in great part the errors of Antony Gunther, condemned in the letter to the Cardinal Archbishop of Cologne "*Eximiam tuam,*" Jan. 15, 1847; and in that to the Bishop of Breslau, "*Dolere haud mediocri,*" April 30, 1860.

duty of the former to submit himself to that authority which he shall have proved to be true; but philosophy itself both can and ought to be subject to [the same] authority.[10]

11. The Church has a right to occupy herself with philosophy, to refuse to tolerate its errors, and to assume the care of correcting them.[11]

12. It is false that the decrees of the Apostolic See and of the Roman Congregations impede the free progress of society.[12]

13. The method and principles by which the scholastic Doctors of old cultivated theology are not made inapplicable by the demands of this age and the progress of science.

14. Philosophy must not be studied without paying due regard to supernatural revelation.

§ III.—Indifferentism—Toleration.

15. Every man is free to embrace and profess the religion he shall believe true, guided by the light of reason.[15]

§ III.—Propositions Opposed to "Indifferentism and Latitudinarianism."

15. *No man is free to embrace and profess that religion which he believes to be true, guided by the light of reason!*[15]

---

[10] That is, the principles of natural science as well as those of religious belief are to be determined, not by the deductions of evidence, but by the decisions of the Pope.

[11] This proposition plainly enough implies that the province of infallibility extends to the correction of errors in philosophy, as much as in religion.

[12] The history of the "Dark Ages" is the best commentary upon the falsehood of this proposition.

[15] Hence should "the light of reason" guide a man to believe Popery, he is not free to embrace and profess it!

16. Men may in any religion the way of eternal salvation, and obtain eternal salvation.

17. *The eternal salvation may at least be hoped for of all those who are not at all in the true Church of Christ.*[17]

18. Protestantism is nothing more than another form of the same true Christian religion, in which it is possible to please God equally as in the Catholic Church.[18]

§ IV.—Socialism, Communism, Secret Societies, Biblical Societies, Clerico-Liberal Societies.

Pests of this description are frequently rebuked in the severest terms in the Encyc. "*Qui pluribus,*" Nov. 9, 1846; All. "*Quibus quantisque,*" Aug. 20, 1849; Encyc. "*Noscitis et Nobis cum,*" Dec. 8, 1849; All. "*Singulari quadam,*" Dec. 9, 1854; Encyc. "*Quanto conficiamur mœrore,*" Aug. 10, 1863.

§ V.—Errors concerning the Church and her Rights.

19. The Church is not a true and perfect and entirely free association; she does not enjoy

16. Man cannot find the way of eternal salvation, neither obtain eternal salvation in *any* religion.

17. *The eternal salvation of any out of the true Church of Christ is not even to be hoped for!*[17]

18. Protestantism is not another and diversified form of the one true Christian religion in which it is possible to please God equally as in the Catholic Church.[18]

§ IV.—Propositions opposed to the Errors of "Socialism, Communism, Secret Societies, Bible Societies, Clerico-Liberal Societies."

Pests of this description are frequently condemned in the severest terms in

(1.) The Encyc. "Qui Pluribus," Nov. 9, 1846.
(2.) Allocution "Quibus quantisque," Aug. 20, 1849.
(3.) Encyc. "Nescitis et Nobiscum," Dec. 8, 1849.
(4.) Allocution "Singulari quadam," Dec. 9, 1854.
(5.) Encyc. "Quanto conficiamur mœrore," Aug. 10, 1863.

§ V.—Propositions opposed to "Errors concerning the Church and her Rights."

19. The Church is a true, perfect, and entirely free association; she enjoys peculiar and

[17] Those familiar with the Romish Controversy are aware that the doctrine of Exclusive Salvation is one disavowed by the majority of Romish doctors, who teach that even sincere heretics, although without the pale of the Church, are within the pale of salvation on the ground of what Bishop Milner and others designate "invincible ignorance." The Pope's proposition, which assumes that the Church of Rome is the Church of Christ, clearly condemns Milner and the numerous other Roman Catholic doctors who have thus endeavoured to extend a possible salvation to the heathen and the heretic.

[18] This proposition is a denial of the Christianity of Protestant Churches.

peculiar and perpetual rights conferred upon her by her Divine founder; but it appertains to the civil power to define what are the rights and limits within which the Church may exercise authority.

20. The ecclesiastical power must not exercise its authority without the toleration and assent of the civil Government.[20]

21. *The Church has not the power of defining dogmatically that the religion of the Catholic Church is the only true religion.*[21]

22. The obligation which binds Catholic teachers and authors applies only to those things which are proposed for universal belief as dogmas of the faith by the infallible judgment of the Church.[22]

23. *The Roman Pontiffs and Œcumenical Councils have exceeded the limits of their power, have usurped the rights of Princes, and have even committed errors in defining matters of faith and morals.*[23]

24. *The Church has not the power of availing herself of force or any direct or indirect temporal power.*[24]

25. In addition to the authority inherent in the Episcopate, further temporal power is granted

perpetual rights conferred upon her by her Divine founder, and it neither belongs to the civil power to define what are these rights of the Church, nor the limits within which she may exercise them.

20. The ecclesiastical power has a right to exercise its authority independent of the toleration or assent of the civil Government.[20]

21. *The Church has power to define dogmatically the religion of the Catholic Church to be the only true religion.*[21]

22. The obligation which securely binds Catholic teachers and writers is not limited to those things which are proposed by the infallible judgment of the Church as dogmas of faith for belief by all.[22]

23. *The Roman Pontiffs and Œcumenical Councils have never exceeded the limits of their power, or usurped the rights of Princes, much less committed errors in defining matters of faith and morals.*"[23]

24. *The Church has the power of employing force and (of exercising) direct and indirect temporal power.*[24]

25. The temporal power which is expressly or tacitly conceded by the civil authority as belong-

---

[20] This proposition modestly assumes only independence of the civil power, but the real doctrine implied is not merely ecclesiastical *independence* but ecclesiastical *supremacy* in relation to the civil government.

[21] This proposition again involves a denial of the Christianity of the Eastern and Protestant Churches.

[22] This proposition involves Romish teachers and authors in subjection to the Church of Rome, not only in religion, but in temporal concerns.

[23] History affords a multitude of proofs for the falsehood of this proposition; and hence the deliverance itself affords an additional illustration of the Scriptural mark which characterizes Rome as "speaking lies in hypocrisy." This proposition involves an approval of all the intolerant Bulls of Popes.

[24] By "force" here the Pope obviously means physical or material appliances.

to it by the civil authority, either expressly or tacitly, which power is on that account also revocable by the civil authority whenever it pleases.[25]

26. The Church has not the natural and legitimate right of acquisition and possession.[26]

27. *The ministers of the Church and the Roman Pontiff ought to be absolutely excluded from all charge and dominion over temporal affairs.*[27]

28. *Bishops have not the right of promulgating even their Apostolical letters without the sanction of the Government.*[28]

29. *Dispensations granted by the Roman Pontiff must be considered null, unless they have been requested by the civil Government.*[29]

30. The immunity of the Church and of ecclesiastical persons derives its origin from civil law.[30]

31. Ecclesiastical jurisdiction for the temporal causes, whether civil or criminal, of the clergy, ought by all means to be abolished even without the concurrence and against the protest of the Holy See.

32. The personal immunity exonerating the clergy from military service may be abolished without violation either of natural right or of equity. Its abolition is called for by civil progress, especially in a community consti-

ing to the Episcopacy, in addition to the power inherent in it, is not revocable at the pleasure of the civil authority.[25]

26. The Church has a natural and legitimate right of acquiring and possessing [property].[26]

27. *The ministers of the Holy Church and the Roman Pontiff should be allowed the free exercise of the charge and dominion which the Church claims over temporal interests.*[27]

28. *Bishops have the right of promulgating [more especially] their apostolic letters without the sanction of the Government.*[28]

29. *Dispensations [or spiritual boons] granted by the Roman Pontiff are to be considered valid even when they have not been solicited by the civil Government.*[29]

30. Neither the immunities of the Church or of ecclesiastical persons have their origin in civil law.[30]

31. Ecclesiastical jurisdiction in cases of clerics, and either for civil or criminal offences, cannot be abolished without the concurrence or against the consent of the Holy See.

32. The personal immunity by which clerics are exempted from the burden of military service cannot be abrogated without a violation of equity and of natural law; and it is false that this abrogation is verily demanded by

---

[25] This gives temporal power to the Bishops as an inalienable right.

[26] This sanctions Rome in its acquisition of property.

[27] This claims for the spirituality a right to interfere in the temporality.

[28] Although these "Apostolic Letters" are but the constant vehicles of treason and sedition.

[29] This gives full scope to the dispensing power of the Pope, a power exercised in the reign of Elizabeth, in the release of Romanists from their allegiance to the Queen.

[30] This makes the ecclesiastic independent of the civil tribunal.

tuted upon principles of Liberal Government.

33. It does not appertain exclusively to ecclesiastical jurisdiction by any right proper and inherent, to direct the teaching of theological subjects.

34. *The doctrine of those who compare the Sovereign Pontiff to a free sovereignty acting in the Universal Church is a doctrine which prevailed in the Middle Ages only.*[34]

35. *There would be no obstacle to the sentence of a General Council or the act of all the universal peoples transferring the Pontifical sovereignty from the Bishop and city of Rome to some other bishopric and some other city.*[35]

36. The definition of a National Council does not admit of any subsequent discussion, and the civil power can settle an affair as decided by such National Council.

37. National Churches can be established after being withdrawn and separated from the authority of the Roman Pontiff.

38. *Many Roman Pontiffs have, by their too arbitrary conduct, contributed to the division of the Church into Eastern and Western.*[38]

§ VI.—Errors about Civil Society, considered both in itself and in its Relation to the Church.

39. The State is the origin and source of all rights, and possesses

civil progress, or in a commonwealth constituted even on the principles of Liberal Government.

33. It belongs to ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and by a proper and inherent right, to decide upon doctrine in theological questions.

34. *The doctrine which equalled the Roman Pontiff to an absolute Prince, acting in the Universal Church, is not a doctrine which prevailed merely in the Middle Ages.*[34]

35. *Neither by the sentence of a General Council, nor the voice of the universal people, could the Pontifical sovereignty of the Bishop and city of Rome be transferred to some other bishop and city.*[35]

36. The definition of a National Council admits of further discussion, and no civil power can require that things remain as fixed by it.

37. No National Church can be instituted in a state of division and separation from the authority of the Roman Pontiff.

38. *It is false to assert that the extravagant acts of some Roman Pontiffs led to the Eastern and Western divisions of the Church.*[38]

§ VI.—Propositions opposed to "The Errors of Civil Society considered both in itself and in its relation to the Church."

39. The government of the commonwealth is neither the

[34] The indication of the proposition is, that the Pope has been *always* an "absolute Prince," and retains this absolute power at the present day.

[35] Yet Clement V., in the year 1309, removed the seat of the Papacy to Avignon in France, and his successors continued exiles from Rome for 70 years. This proposition now binds the Papacy to the city of Rome.

[38] And yet, what the Pope here asserts to be *false*, history asserts to be indubitably *true*.

rights which are not circumscribed by any limits.

40. *The teaching of the Catholic Church is opposed to the well-being and interests of society.*

41. The Civil Government, even when exercised by an infidel Sovereign, possesses an indirect and negative power over religious affairs. It, therefore, possesses not only the right called that of *Exequatur*, but also that of the (so-called) *Appellatio ab abusu*, ["*Appel comme d'abus.*"][41]

42. *In the case of conflicting laws between the two Powers, the Civil Law ought to prevail.*[42]

43. *The Lay Power has the authority to rescind, declare and render null solemn Conventions or Concordats relating to the use of rights appertaining to ecclesiastical immunity, without the consent of the Apostolic See, and even in spite of its protest.*[43]

44. The Civil Authority may interfere in matters related to religion, morality, and spiritual government; whence it has control over the instructions for the guidance of consciences issued, conformably with their mission, by the Pastors of the Church. Further, it possesses power to decree in the matter of administering the Divine Sacraments and as to the dispositions necessary for their reception.

origin and source of all rights, nor does it possess power uncircumscribed by limits.

40. *The doctrine of the Catholic Church is agreeable to the well-being and interests of society.*

41. No indirect or negative [much less, direct or positive] power in sacred things belongs to the Civil Government, even when exercised by a Catholic Sovereign; and it therefore neither possesses the right called *Exequatur* nor that called *Appellatio ab abusu.*[41]

42. *In legal conflicts between both Powers* (Civil and Ecclesiastical) *the Ecclesiastical Law prevails.*[42]

43. *No Lay Power has authority to rescind, declare and render null, solemn Conventions* (commonly called Concordats) *relative to the use of rights proper to the Ecclesiastical Community, without the consent of the Apostolic See.*[43]

44. No Civil Authority can interfere in matters relative to religion, morality, and spiritual government; whence it has no control over the instructions which the Pastors of the Church deliver by virtue of their charge, for the regulation of consciences. Further, no Civil Authority has power to decide in matters pertaining to the Sacraments or to the dispositions necessary for receiving them.

---

[41] In Roman Catholic States, various legal provisions exist to restrain the encroachments of the Papal upon the Civil Power, particularly the statutes called *Placet Royal*, *Exequatur*, and *Appellatio ab abusu*. The *Placet Royal* empowers the sovereign with the right of *inspection* and *prevention* in relation to such aggressions; the *Exequatur* includes the severer power of *prosecution;* and the *Appellatio ab abusu*, that is, an appeal (to the civil power in cases arising) from or out of abuses, empowers the sovereign to receive such appeals, in all cases where the subject feels himself politically aggrieved by any ecclesiastical process—and it is these that the Pope condemns.

[42] The proposition distinctly sets forth the Supremacy of the Church in relation to the State.

[43] This withdraws ecclesiastics from State control.

45. The entire direction of Public Schools in which the youth of Christian States are educated, except (to a certain extent) in the case of Episcopal Seminaries, may and must appertain to the Civil Power, and belong to it so far that no other authority whatsoever shall be recognised as having any right to interfere in the discipline of the Schools, the arrangement of the studies, the taking of degrees, or the choice and approval of the teachers.

46. Further, even in Clerical Seminaries, the mode of study to be adopted must be submitted to the civil authority.

47. The best theory of civil society requires that Popular Schools open to the children of all classes, and, generally, all public institutes intended for the instruction in letters and philosophy and for conducting the education of the young, should be freed from all ecclesiastical authority, government, and interference, and should be completely subjected to the Civil and Political Power in conformity with the will of rulers and the prevalent opinions of the age.

48. *This system of instructing youth, which consists in separating it from the Catholic faith and from the power of the Church,* and in teaching it exclusively the knowledge of natural things and the earthly ends of social life alone, *may be perfectly approved by Catholics.*[48]

49. The Civil Power is entitled to prevent ministers of religion and the faithful from communicating freely and mutually with each other and with the Roman Pontiff.

45. The direction of Public Schools in which the youth of Christian States are brought up, much less the Episcopal Seminaries partially excepted (in the condemned propositions), neither can nor ought to be assumed by the Civil Authority alone; or in such a manner that no right shall be recognised on the part of any other authority to interfere in the dispositions of the Schools, in the regulation of the studies, in the appointment of degrees, and in the selection and approval of masters.

46. Much more therefore the method of study to be adopted in Clerical Schools must be exempted from civil authority.

47. It is false that the best [educational] condition of civil society demands that Popular Schools open to the children of all classes, or that the generality of public institutions designed for letters and for the superior instruction and more extended cultivation of youth, should be free from all ecclesiastical authority, government, and interference, and should be completely subjected to the Civil and Political Authority in conformity with the will of rulers and the prevalent opinions of the age.

48. *Catholics cannot approve of a system of education for youth apart from the Catholic faith, and disjoined from the authority of the Church,* and which regards primarily or prominently the knowledge of natural things, and the ends of social life.[48]

49. No civil authority has power to prevent the chief priests [bishops] of religion and the faithful of the people from communicating freely between each other, and with the Roman Pontiff.

---

[48] The Pope disclaims the power of the State to institute any educational system which fails to embrace the exclusive inculcation of his religious creed.

50. The Lay Authority possesses, as inherent in itself, the right of presenting Bishops, and may require of them that they take possession of their dioceses before having received canonical institution and the Apostolical Letters of the Holy See.

51. And, further, the Lay Government has the right of deposing Bishops from their pastoral functions, and is not bound to obey the Roman Pontiff in those things which relate to Bishops' Sees and the institution of Bishops.

52. *The Government has of itself the right to alter the age prescribed by the Church for the religious profession both of men and women; and may enjoin upon all religious establishments to admit no person to take solemn vows without its permission.*[52]

53. The laws for the protection of Religious Establishments and securing their rights and duties ought to be abolished; nay, more, the *Civil Government may lend its assistance to all who desire to quit the religious life which they have undertaken, and to break their vows.* The Government may also extinguish Religious Orders, collegiate churches, and simple benefices, even those belonging to private patronage, and submit their goods and revenues to the administration and disposal of the civil power.

54. *Kings and Princes are not only exempt from the jurisdiction of the Church, but are superior to the Church in litigated questions of jurisdiction.*[54]

50. No Lay Authority has in itself the right of appointing bishops, or to require them to take charge of their dioceses before they have received canonical institution and Letters Apostolic from the Holy See.

51. Further, the Lay Government has not the right of deposing bishops from the exercise of their pastoral duties, and is bound to obey the Roman Pontiff in matters which pertain to Bishops and their Sees.

52. *No government possesses the right to change the age prescribed by the Church for religious profession both of men and women, or to prohibit religious establishments to admit persons to solemn engagements without its permission.*[52]

53. Laws which protect Religious Establishments or secure their rights and duties may not be abrogated by Civil Government; nay, more—

The Civil Government may not lend its assistance to any who seek to quit the religious life they have undertaken, and to break their vows! also—

Civil Government cannot suppress Religious Orders, collegiate churches, or simple benefices, even although privately endowed; nor subject their goods or revenues to the administration or disposal of the civil power.

54. *Kings and Princes are not only not exempt from the jurisdiction of the Church, but are subordinate to the Church in litigated questions of jurisdiction!*[54]

---

[52] Monastic legislation is to be independent of all secular interference.

[54] The condemnation of Propositions from 44 to 54 excludes the State from all interference in religious matters—a conclusion of which the Liberation Society would approve! See also Prop. 42.

55. The Church ought to be separated from the State, and the State from the Church.

55. The Church ought to be in union with the State, and the State with the Church.

§ VII.—Errors concerning Natural and Christian Ethics.

§ VII.—Propositions opposed to Errors in "Natural and Christian Morality."

56. Moral laws do not stand in need of the Divine sanction, and there is no necessity that human laws should be conformable to the law of nature and receive their sanction from God.

56. Moral laws require the Divine sanction, and human laws should both be conformable to the law of nature and receive their obligations from God.

57. Knowledge of philosophical things, and morals, and civil laws, may and must be independent of Divine and ecclesiastical authority.[57]

57. Philosophical principles, moral science, and civil laws, may and must be made to bend (declinari) to Divine and Ecclesiastical authority.[57]

58. No other forces are to be recognised except those which reside in matter, and all moral teaching and moral excellence ought to be made to consist in the accumulation and increase of riches by every possible means, and in the enjoyment of pleasure.

58. Other forces are to be recognised besides those which reside in matter; and moral and virtuous teaching should not consist in the inculcation of means to be employed (collocari) in the accumulation and increase of riches, or of voluptuous gratification.

59. Right consists in the material fact. All human duties are vain words, and all human acts have the force of right.

59. It is false (to assert) that right consists in the natural fact; that all human obligations are an empty name, and that all human facts have the force of right.

60. Authority is nothing else but the result of numerical superiority and material force.

60. It is false that all authority is simply (the power contained in) the sum of material forces and numbers.

61. An unjust act being successful inflicts no injury upon the sanctity of right.

61. An injustice in the fact, even although successful, inflicts injury on the sanctity of right.

62. The principle of non-intervention ought to be proclaimed and adhered to.[62]

62. The principle of non-intervention ought neither to be proclaimed nor observed.[62]

63. *It is allowable to refuse obedience to legitimate Princes; nay, more, to rise in insurrection against them.*[63]

63. *Subjects may not refuse obedience to legitimate Princes, much less rise in insurrection against them.*[63]

---

[57] "Ecclesiastical authority" can only signify *Papal authority*, or the authority of the Pope—an authority which here seeks not merely to rule the human mind in the province of religion, but to control the unbending decisions of Philosophy and Science, and to over-ride all authority in the sphere of civil legislation!

[62] The Pope condemns non-intervention.

[63] The Canon Law assigns to the Pope the power of deciding who are "legitimate Princes;" consequently the above Proposition

64. The violation of a solemn oath, nay, any wicked and flagitious action repugnant to the eternal law, is not only not blameable, but quite lawful, and worthy of the highest praise when done from the love of one's country.[64]

64. The violation of a solemn oath, as well as any vicious and flagitious action repugnant to the eternal law, is not only blameable, but is wholly unlawful, and deserving of the highest censure even when done from a love of country.[64]

§ VIII.—Errors concerning Christian Marriage.

65. *It cannot be by any means tolerated to maintain that Christ has raised marriage to the dignity of a sacrament.*

66. The sacrament of marriage is only an adjunct of the contract, and separable from it, and the sacrament itself only consists in the nuptial benediction.

67. By the law of nature the marriage tie is not indissoluble, and in many cases divorce, properly so called, may be pronounced by the civil authority.

68. The Church has not the power of laying down what are diriment impediments to marriage. The civil authority does possess such a power, and can abolish impediments that may exist to marriage.

69. In the better ages, the Church, when she laid down certain impediments as diriment to marriage, did so not of her own authority, but by a right borrowed from the civil power.

70. The Canons of the Council of Trent, which pronounce censure of anathema against those who deny the Church the right of laying down what are diri-

§ VIII.—Propositions opposed to "Errors concerning Matrimony."

65. *It is capable of proof from reason, that Christ has elevated marriage to the dignity of a sacrament.*

66. The sacrament of marriage is not merely an adjunct to the contract, and separable from it; and the sacrament itself does not consist merely in the nuptial benediction.

67. The marriage tie is indissoluble by the law of nature; divorce, properly so called, cannot in any case be pronounced by the civil authority.

68. The Church has the power of deciding what are diriment [or divorcing] impediments to marriage; no civil authority possesses such a power, nor can it abolish impediments that may exist to marriage.

69. In the more backward ages, when the Church laid down certain impediments as diriment to marriage, she did so of her own authority, and not by right borrowed from the civil power.

70. The Canons of the Council of Trent, which invoke the censure of anathema against such as deny the Church the right of determining what are diriment

---

interpreted by this Papal Statute-book, and more especially by the facts of history, simply signifies that subjects are not to "refuse obedience to Princes," *unless when the Pope decides upon their illegitimacy, and thereby releases their subjects from the bond of allegiance.*

[64] The power to relax the most "solemn oath," is notoriously one of the prerogatives claimed for the Pope by the expositors of Canon-Law. See also Prop. 29.

ment impediments, either are not dogmatic, or must be understood as referring to such borrowed power.

71. *The form of solemnising marriage prescribed by the said Council, under penalty of nullity, does not bind in cases where the civil law has appointed another form, and decrees that this new form shall effectuate a valid marriage.*

72. Boniface VIII. is the first who declared that the vow of chastity pronounced at Ordination annuls marriage.

73. A merely civil contract may among Christians constitute a true marriage; and *it is false either that the marriage-contract between Christians must always be a sacrament, or that the contract is null if the sacrament be excluded.*[73]

74. Matrimonial causes and espousals belong by their nature to civil jurisdiction.

impediments to marriage, are dogmatic, and not to be understood as emanating from such a borrowed power [or power conferred by the State].

71. *The form [of solemnising marriage according to the said Council] of Trent, under penalty of nullity, binds even in cases where the civil law has appointed another form, and decrees that this new form shall effectuate a valid marriage.*

72. It is false that Boniface VIII. [as represented by the condemned propositions] was the first who declared that the vow of chastity pronounced at Ordination annuls marriage [that is, in previously married priests].

73. Marriage among Christians cannot be constituted by any mere civil contract; *the marriage-contract among Christians must always be a sacrament; and the contract is null, if the sacrament does not exist.*[73]

74. Matrimonial causes and espousals belong, by their nature, to ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

N.B.—Two other errors may tend in this direction upon the abolition of the Celibacy of Priests and the preference due to the state of marriage over that of virginity. These have been refuted; the first in the Encyclical "*Qui pluribus,*" Nov. 9, 1846; the second in the Letters Apostolical "*Multiplices inter,*" June 10, 1851.

§ IX. — Errors regarding the Civil Power of the Sovereign Pontiff.

75. *The children of the Christian and Catholic Church are not agreed upon the compatibility of the temporal with the spiritual power.*[75]

76. *The abolition of the tem-*

§ IX.—Propositions opposed to "Errors regarding the Civil Power of the Roman Pontiff."

75. *It is false that the children of the Christian and Catholic Church dispute between themselves upon the compatibility of the temporal with the spiritual power!*[75]

76. *The abrogation of the tem-*

---

[73] By this proposition, married Protestants of every class are pronounced to be living in adultery, and all Protestant children, although born in scriptural wedlock, are bastardized. Propositions 71 and 73 nullify *all marriages not Roman!*

[75] Although the Italian Priest, Father Passagli, with nearly 10,000 of his brethren in office, have notoriously dissented from

poral power of which the Apostolic See is possessed, would contribute in the greatest degree to the liberty and prosperity of the Church.[76]

poral power upon which the Apostolic See is based, would not contribute to either the liberty or the happiness of the Church.[76]

N.B.—Beside these errors, explicitly noted, very many others are rebuked by the certain doctrine which all Catholics are bound most firmly to hold touching the temporal Sovereignty of the Roman Pontiff. These doctrines are clearly stated in the Allocutions "*Quantis quantumque*," April 20, 1859, and "*Si semper antea*," May 20, 1850; Letters Apost. "*Quam Catholica Ecclesia*," March 26, 1860; Allocutions "*Novas*," Sept. 28, 1860, "*Jamdudum*," March 18, 1861 and "*Maxima quidem*," June 9, 1862.

§ X.—Errors having reference to Modern Liberalism.

77. *In the present day it is no longer necessary that the Catholic religion shall be held as the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all other modes of worship.*

78. *Whence it has been wisely provided by the law, in some countries called Catholic, that persons coming to reside therein shall enjoy the free exercise of their own worship.*[78]

79. Moreover it is false that the civil liberty of every mode of worship and the full power given to all of overtly and publicly manifesting their opinions and their ideas conduce more easily to corrupt the morals and minds of the people, and to the propagation of the pest of indifferentism.[79]

80. *The Roman Pontiff can and ought to reconcile himself to, and agree with, Progress, Liberalism, and Modern Civilisation.*[80]

§ X.—Propositions opposed to "Errors referring to Modern Liberalism."

77. *It is necessary even in the present day that the Catholic religion shall be held as the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all other forms of worship.*

78. *Whence it has been unwisely provided by law, in some countries called Catholic, that persons coming to reside therein shall enjoy the free exercise of their religion.*[78]

79. The civil liberty of every mode of worship, and full power given to all of openly and publicly manifesting their opinions and their ideas, conduce more easily to corrupt the morals and minds of the people, and to the propagation of the pest of indifferentism.[79]

80. *The Roman Pontiff cannot and ought not to reconcile himself to, or agree with, Progress, Liberalism, and Modern Civilisation.*[80]

---

the civil power of the Papacy, and are at present agitating Italy for its overthrow.

[76] This condemnation asserts the temporal power of the Pope.

[78] Here is a sweeping condemnation of the rights of conscience!

[79] Free discussion is condemned!

[80] The Pope refuses to advance!

(No. III.)

The question of Infallibility, which has been so long controverted amongst Romanists, has now been determined by the Council of Rome (1870) in the following decrees:—

"If then any shall say that the Roman Pontiff has the office merely of inspection or direction, and not *full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the Universal Church, not only in things which belong to faith and morals, but also in those which relate to the discipline and government of the Church spread throughout the world;* or assert that he possesses merely the principal part, and not *all the fulness* of this supreme power; or that this power which he enjoys is not ordinary or immediate both over each and all the churches, and over each and all the pastors and the faithful; let him be ANATHEMA." "Therefore faithfully adhering to the tradition received from the beginning of the Christian faith (!).....We teach and define that it is a dogma divinely revealed, that the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*,—that is, when in discharge of the office of Pastor and Doctor of all Christians, by virtue of his supreme Apostolic authority, he defines a doctrine regarding faith or morals to be held by the Universal Church, by the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter,—*is possessed of that infallibility* with which the Divine Redeemer willed that his Church should be endowed for defining doctrine regarding faith or morals, and that therefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are *irreformable*.....of *themselves*, and *not from the consent of the Church.*"—*Vatican Council*, pp. 114, 119.

This dogma was strongly opposed by the most able Bishops in the Council. It intensifies the evils of the Romish system, to the great dissatisfaction of some clergy, and many of the laity. In Germany and other places, this dissatisfaction has assumed the form of open resistance in the Old Catholic movement. The question of Infallibility is now reduced to that of the Pope. The Council of Baltimore, held in 1866, says:—

"And because where Peter is, there also is the Church, and because Peter speaks in the person of the Roman Pontiff, ever lives in his successors, passes judgment, and makes known the truths of faith to those who seek them; therefore are the Divine declarations to be received in that sense in which they have been and are held by this Roman See of blessed Peter."—*Vatican Council*, p. 74, *Tablet Office.*

In accordance with these views, the work entitled "The

Vatican Council" comes to the conclusion: "it cannot be said that *Councils are in any way necessary.*"—P. 5.

And certainly this view is in strict harmony with the above decree, which asserts that the Infallibility of the Church is in the Pope!

Practically, the Rule of Faith followed by Roman Catholics is not Scripture and tradition, but, in time past, the decrees of Councils and Popes, and now *of Popes*, in whom the plenary power is supposed to exist. Practically and immediately the Rule of Faith is the teaching of the Priest.

Waterworth observes that the Council of Trent did not assert for the Pope "that pre-eminence which had been proclaimed in the Council of Florence and that of Lateran" (p. ccxlix.). It left open the question of the Pope's infallibility. The Vatican Council has decided that the Pope is infallible when speaking *ex cathedra* on matters "de fide et moribus" (of faith and morals); but it has not defined the extent of that authority.

There are consequently now two parties in the Church of Rome,—THE MAXIMISTS AND THE MINIMISTS,—the former extending his infallible authority to every authoritative statement; the other limiting it to definitions of faith and morals. This is a very grave difference, affecting even foundations. The German Bishops are generally of the latter school; the Italians and the majority of others of the former school. There is little doubt that the Maximists are the true Romanists, and probably another Papal utterance will settle the point. But what then? Will not the German Bishops, and those who sympathize with their views, come to the conclusion that the pretensions of the Papacy can no longer be borne? CONTROVERSY, THEREFORE, HAS NOT ENDED IN THE CHURCH OF ROME.

INDEX.

A

ABSOLUTION, Power of, claimed by Romish Priests, 75–80.
AGOBARDUS, Admission of, against Image-Worship, 206.
ALEXANDER of Hales, his Admission as to Confirmation, 70.
ALIACO, Cardinal, his Admission as to Transubstantiation, 110
AMBROSE on Apostolic Succession, 77.
ANGELS, Worship of, see "Saints."
ANONYMOUS, Rejoinder to his answers to "Questions on the Creed of Pius IV.," 253–257.
APOCRYPHA, the Reasons for its Rejection, 56, 57.
AQUINAS, Thomas, teaches that heretics are to be put to death, 228.
ASHES, Holy, Romish Prayer in making, 94.
ATONEMENT of Christ is perfectly complete, 167.
ATTRITION, Nature of, 76.
AUGUSTINE teaches that there are properly but Two Sacraments, 71.
Declares that John vi. 51, *et seq.*, must be understood figuratively, 112.
On Free Grace, 101, 102.
Denies that Peter was "the Rock," 219, 220.
AURICULAR CONFESSION, see "Confession."

B

BAPTISM, Infant, proved from Scripture, 57.
BELIEVER, The, immediately after death passes to glory, 168–169.
BELLARMINE'S Argument for Tradition Refuted, 27, 28.
His Admission as to Mark vi. 13, in reference to Extreme Unction, 67.
His Admission as to the Uncertainty which the Doctrine of Intention involves, 73.
His anecdote of the appearance of St Christina from Purgatory, 159, 160.
Says that a Drunkard was worshipped as a Saint, in the time of Pope Alexander III., 189.

BELLARMINE Admits the Fallibility of Councils, 47.
His testimony to the want of unanimity among the Fathers relative to 1 Cor. iii. 13–15, 166.
BELLS, Holy, Blessing of, 95.
BENEDICT XIV. refers to the Third Canon of the Fourth Council of Lateran, 233.
BIBLE, Objections to it as the only Rule of Faith answered, 57–60.
Rule of Faith in Mosaic Age, 60–62.
Rule of Faith in Apostolic Age, 62–64.
Only Rule of Faith, because the only inspired one, 64.
BIEL admits that Transubstantiation is not taught in the Bible, 110.
BISHOPS, Romish Ceremony of Consecration of, 92.
BOSSUET, His Argument for Tradition, 26.
His Argument for Penance, 75.
BRAZEN SERPENT, Destruction of, an Argument against Image-Worship, 206.
BUTLER, Charles, on Councils, 46, 47.

C

CAJETAN, Cardinal, his Admission as to James v. 14, 15, in reference to Extreme Unction, 68.
His Admission as to Ephesians v. 32, in reference to Matrimony, 69.
CANUS, his Admission as to the non-sacramental character of Matrimony, 70.
CASSANDER on the Seven Sacraments, 71.
Says that ancient Fathers abhorred Image-Worship, 207.
CELIBACY, Clerical, disproved from Scripture, 69, 70.
Dangerous Nature of, 87–89.
CHERUBIM, according to Roman Catholic authority were *not* adored by Israelites, 205, 206.
CHILLINGWORTH on the Church of Rome as the Guide of Faith, 51–53.
CHRISM, Adoration of, 95.
CHRYSOSTOM on the *Two* Sacraments, 72.
On Christian Sacrifice, 137, 138.
CHURCH, The, the Rule of Faith to the Romanist, 25, 27, 34.
A few Divines assembled in Council are, after all, according to Romish Doctrine, the Church, 34.
CLEMANGIS, Nicolaus, declares that the law of Universal Church was against Image-Worship, 207.

COMMANDMENTS, the Ten, mutilated by Church of Rome to justify Image-Worship, 208.
COMMANDMENT, Second, removed from certain Romish Catechisms, 208.
COMMUNION IN ONE KIND, Arguments in favour of, answered, 151–156.
Arguments against, 156, 157.
Declared to be a novelty by Council of Constance, and several Fathers, 156, 157.
Protestant Translation of 1 Corinthians xi. 27 sustained 153–155.
CONFESSION, Auricular, Texts quoted in favour of, explained, 84, 85.
Public, practised by early Christians, 84.
As practised by Church of Rome, is an infringement on Prerogatives of God, 85.
Reasons against, 85–89.
Advances the power of the Priesthood, 85.
Immoral, 87.
CONFESSIONAL, Priest recognised as God in the, 86.
Liguori on Immorality of the, 88.
CONFIRMATION not a Sacrament, 67.
CONSTANCE, Council of, declares a Council above a Pope, 48.
CONTRITION, Nature of, 75, 76.
COUNCILS, such as that of Trent, are not General, 35.
Since Chalcedon, not General, 47, 48.
Have contradicted each other, and thus proved their Fallibility, 48.
No Infallible Authority has decided between the claims of opposing, 49.
The Primitive Church had no Councils. Had she therefore no certain Rule? 49.
A Dilemma, 50.
Infallibility of, practically useless, 50.
Have proved their Fallibility by teaching Falsehood, 50.
Sanction Persecution, 227–234.
Fallibility of, Admitted by Bellarmine, 47.
List of, 257.
CREED of Pope Pius IV. Un-catholic, and contrary to the Decrees of the Ancient Church, 235–240.
Old or Nicene, 239.
A New Creed, 239.
CROSS, Prayers and Adoration offered to, when being consecrated, 199–201.

D

DEFECTS in the Mass, 119.
DEVIL, Ceremony for driving, out of Oil, 95.
DIVISIONS, many in the Church of Rome itself, 38, 39.
in Church in Apostolic times, 39.
DOMINICUS SOTO, his Admission as to the non-sacramental character of Episcopal Ordination, 70.
DOMINUS DENS on the putting to death of Heretics, 233.
DURANDUS, his Admission as to the non-sacramental character of Matrimony, 71.

E

ENCYCLICAL LETTER of PIUS IX., 8th Dec. 1864, 259.
Bible Societies condemned, sec. 4, 288.
Educational Establishments bound to teach the Roman Catholic religion, props. 45–48, 292.
Force, Alleged Prerogative of the Church to employ, prop. 24, 289.
Infallibility of Popes and Councils, prop. 23, 289.
Kings and States subject to the authority of the Pope in temporals as well as spirituals, 282; props. 19–54, 289.
Liberty of Conscience and Worship condemned, 278; props. 15, 77, 78, 287, 298.
Monasteries and Nunneries exempt from State Legislation; props. 52, 53, 294.
No Salvation out of the Church of Rome, prop. 17, 288.
Papacy cannot remove from Rome, prop. 35, 291.
Protestant Marriage not valid, props. 70–74, 296.
Virgin Mary, the Pope's Worship of the, 284.
EPHESUS, Council of, pronounces it Unlawful to add any Creed to the Nicene, 238.
EXORCISTS, Romish Ceremony for Ordination of, to Drive out Devils, 90.
EXTREME UNCTION not warranted by Scripture, and not a Sacrament, 67, 68.
Some Ceremonies of, 96.

F

FAITH, the only means of a Sinner's Justification, 97–105.
FATHERS, the Works of, do not contain a unanimous Tradition, 30, 31.
FIGURATIVE EXPRESSIONS in Scripture, Examples of, 116, 117.
FRANKFORT, Council of, declares that Image-Worship was condemned by Primitive Church, 207.

G

GONZALEZ DE CASTIGLIO poisoned by the Consecrated Wafer, 123.
GOOD WORKS only the Evidences and Fruit of Salvation, 104, 105.

H

HINCMARUS against Images, 207.
HOLY GHOST proceeds from both Father and Son, 58.
HOLY WATER—Ceremony for making Water Holy, 93.

I

IDOLATRY of Mass, probable even on Romish Authority, 119–124.
IMAGES, Differences amongst Romanists as to the Nature of Worship due to, 198–199.
Worship of, as practised by the Church of Rome, 199.
The Benediction of the Cross and other Images, 200, 201.
Prayers to, 202, 203.
Wood of, worshipped, 202.
Miracles of, 203, 204.
Arguments in favour of, answered, 205, 206.
Admissions of learned Romanists against, 206, 207.
Condemned by Scripture, 207–209.
IMMACULATE CONCEPTION OF VIRGIN MARY stated and disproved, 179–183.
Fathers against, 180.
Doctors against, 180.
Saints against, 181.
Popes against, 181.
Scripture against, 183.
INCENSE, Holy, Ceremony for making, 94.
INDULGENCES, Doctrine of Rome as to, 211–213.
Specimens of, 213–215.
Rome's Arguments in favour of, answered, 215.
Fallacious, and opposed to Scripture, 215–217.
INFALLIBILITY, and the dogma of 1870, 34, 45.
Attributed generally to a few Divines in Council, headed by the Pope, 34.
Arguments in favour of, answered, 35–42.
The assumed Infallibity of Rome has not prevented the existence of Difference of Opinion, even within her own pale, 40.

INFALLIBILITY, Texts quoted in favour of, explained, 39–42
Claimed by Mormonites as well as Romanists, 45.
An Infallible Church would need an Infallible Foundation, which Rome has not, 40.
Not in Councils, 47–50.
The silence of Scripture as to, disproves their Pretension, 50.
Disproved by the Positive Declaration of the Apostle, 51.
Of the Roman Church, disproved by express declaration of Scripture, 54.
Chillingworth on, 51–53.
INQUISITION, The, sanctioned by Popes, 228.
INTENTION, the Doctrine of, leads to great uncertainty as to the Validity of Sacraments, 72, 73.

J

JEROME denies that "the Rock" was Peter, 220.
On the Sacraments, 71.
JOSEPHUS as to the Bread and Wine brought forth by Melchisedec, 139.
JUSTIFICATION, Doctrine of, taught by the Church of Rome, 97–102.
Is not given in Baptism, 102.
Cannot be increased, 102.
Cannot be lost, 103.
Not by Works, 104, 105.

L

LATERAN, Council of, Persecuting Canon of, 231, 232.
LIBERTY of CONSCIENCE and WORSHIP condemned by the Pope, 261, 278, 298.
LIGUORI on Papal Infallibility, 40.
On the Confessional, 88.
LOMBARD was the first who defined the Septennary Number of the Sacraments, 71.
LYNDE, Sir H., Challenge of, relative to Seven Sacraments, 72.

M

MARY, Religious Worship by the Church of Rome, given to, 173, 266, 284.
She is represented as the Dispenser of Mercy, 175.
The Blasphemous Psalter of, 176, 177.
The Scapular of, 178, 179.
MASS, the Doctrine of, explained, 134, 135.
Texts quoted in favour of, explained, 135–139.
Statements of certain Fathers as to Christian Sacrifice, 137–138.

MASS, Negative Scripture Argument against, 142–145.
Positive Scripture Argument against, 145–147.
Rev. Geo. Hamilton on, 147–149.
MATRIMONY not a Sacrament, 69.
Romish Mistranslation of Ephesians v. 32, in order to establish the Sacramental character of Matrimony, 69.
Pius IX. on, 274, 296.
MEDIATOR, Christ the only and all-sufficient, 193, 195.
MILNER, Bishop, on the Church, 27.
MISSAL, on the Defects of the Mass, 119–122.
MORTAR, Holy, Ceremony for making, 94.

N

NICENE CREED alone acknowledged by the Ancient Church, 237.
Continued to be the Formula of Faith, even in the Western Church, until the 16th century, when Pope Pius's Creed was first published, 238.

O

OIL, Ceremony for driving Devil out of, 95.
ORDERS not a Sacrament, 69.
ORIGINAL SIN, Doctrine of the Church of Rome as to, and Baptism, 97–102.

P

PEARSON on the words, "He descended into hell," 168, 169.
PENANCE, Romish, Nature of, 75, 76.
Explanation of Texts quoted in favour of, 77–79.
No Tribunal of, authorised by Scripture, 80, 81.
PERSECUTION of Heretics, sanctioned by General Councils, 227–233.
PETER, the Pope is not his successor, 224.
Was never Bishop of Rome, 224.
PISA, Council of, dethroned two Popes and elected another, 38.
POPE, different opinions among Romish Fathers relative to Infallibility of the, 40, 41.
PRIEST, power of, through the Confessional, 85.
PRIESTS, Ordination of, 91.
PRIVATE JUDGMENT must be exercised in Religion, and even the Romanist is constrained to appeal to it, 37, 38.
The alleged inconvenience of, not remedied by the Church of Rome, 36.
PSALMS, corrupted by Romanists, 176, 177.
PURGATORY, a place of fiery torment, 158–160

PURGATORY, Doctrine of, 159.
Romish Arguments for Venial Sin, 161.
That distinction of Sin refuted, 161, 162.
Romish notion of Temporal Punishment false, 163.
Explanation of Texts quoted in favour of, 164–167
Texts against, 167–170.
PURGATORIAN SOCIETY, Rules of, 215.

Q

QUESTIONS to Roman Catholics on the Creed of Pope Pius IV., 242–253.

R

RITES and CEREMONIES of the Church of Rome, 90–97.
ROME, Church of, not the Mistress of all Churches, 223, 224.
Not the First Church, 225.
Not Catholic in Numbers, 235.
nor in Creed, 236.
Claims the right to exercise its laws in spite of Civil Authority, 265, 282, 292, *et seq.*
RULE of FAITH held by the Church of Rome, 25.
Nominally Scripture and Tradition, but, in reality, the Decrees of Councils, 27.
Not accessible to all, 31.
Objections against Scripture as the Rule of Faith, answered, 57–60.
The Bible the only, proved by Scripture Texts, 60–64.

S

SABBATH, Change from seventh to first day of week, proved from Scripture, 58.
SACRAMENTS, Five New, added by the Church of Rome to Christ's Institution, 67–69.
Many things called by this name by the Fathers which are not, 71.
Admissions of Romish Divines as to the, 70, 71.
SAINTS, Religious Worship given to, 183, 184.
List of, 183, 184.
Prayers offered to God through their Merits, 184.
Arguments in favour of the Invocation of, answered, 186–189.
No one can infallibly know who are, 189, 190.
Alleged Miracles of, 190.
Cannot hear our Prayers, 191.

SAINTS, no Authority for the Invocation of, in Scripture, 192.
The Scriptures repudiate the Worship of, 192, 193.
Christ the only Mediator, 193, 195.
The Invocation of, arises from the Spirit of Antichrist, 194.
The Mediation of, in Heaven would be absolutely unlawful, 195, 196.
SALVATION, None out of the Pale of the Romish Church, a Romish Doctrine, 240.
An Unreasonable Doctrine, 240.
Unscriptural, 240.
SATISFACTION, 76, 211, 212.
SCOTUS admits, that before the Council of Lateran, Transubstantiation was not an Article of Faith, 109.
SCRIPTURE proved by *Evidence*, not by the Authority of the Church, 36, 37.
Romish Objections against, as the sole Rule of Faith, answered, 57–60.
Proof that the Scripture is the only Rule, 60–64.
The written Law the Standard of Appeal in the Mosaic Dispensation, 60–62.
And the Standard of Appeal by Christ and His Apostles, 62–64.
Necessarily the only Rule, because alone inspired, 64.
SUARESIUS says, that several eminent Schoolmen denied the sacramental character of Extreme Unction, 71.
States that several Schoolmen taught that Transubstantiation was not very ancient, 110.
SUPEREROGATORY, Merits of Saints are not, 104, 216, 217.
SUPREMACY of the Pope, Arguments in favour of, answered, 218–222.
Arguments against, 222, 223.
Of the Church of Rome disproved, 223–225.

T

TONSTAL thinks that Transubstantiation should have been left an open question, 110.
TRADITION, received with equal reverence as Scripture, by the Church of Rome, 26.
Romish View of, 25, 26.
Different kinds of, 26.
Reason for which it is called *Unwritten*, 26.
The real question of dispute as to, 27.
Bellarmine's Argument for, refuted, 27.
Texts quoted for, explained, 28.

TRADITION, reasons against, 80–82.
Uncertainty of oral, 80.
The Works of the Fathers and Acts of Councils do not contain a unanimous, 80.
Condemned by Christ, 82.
TRANSUBSTANTIATION as taught by Rome, 107–109.
Admissions of Romish Theologians as to the novelty of, 109, 110.
Not proved by sixth chapter of John, 110–113.
Not proved by the Saviour's Discourse at the Last Supper, 113–115.
Numerous defects may occur, according to the Church of Rome, to prevent the Validity of Consecration, 119–122.
No Romanist can be certain that the Host is not a Poisoned Cake, 122, 123.
Romish uncertainty in this matter, practically inconsistent with the notion of Infallibility, 123, 124.
Scripture against, 126–129.
The Senses against, 131, 132.
TRENT, Council of, Persecuting Decrees of, 229–231.
Decree on Intention, 72.

U

UNCTION, see "Extreme Unction."

V

VENIAL Sin, Arguments for, refuted, 161, 162.
VIRGIL, Polydore, declares that Image-Worship was condemned by early Church, 207.
VIRGIN MARY, see "Immaculate Conception," and "Mary."

W

WATER, Ceremony of making it Holy, 93.
WORSHIP, different kinds of, in Church of Rome, 172.

INDEX TO EXPLANATION

OF

TEXTS QUOTED BY ROMANISTS.

Books of Scripture.	Commencement of Quotation.	Title of Chap.	Page
Gen. 14. 18,	And Melchizedek,	The Mass,	Ch. 13, 138
Exod. 25. 18,	Thou shalt make two Cherubims,	Image-Worship,	Ch. 20, 205
Numb. 5. 6,	Speak unto the children of Israel,	Auric. Confess.,	Ch. 7, 84
... 21. 8,	And the Lord said unto Moses,	Image-Worship,	Ch. 20, 205
Ps. 110. 4,	Thou art a priest for ever,	The Mass,	Ch. 13, 136
Prov. 24. 16,	The just man falleth,	Purgatory,	Ch. 16, 161
Ezek. 18. 4,	The soul that sinneth,	ib.	Ch. 16, 161
Zech. 1. 12,	Then the Angel of the Lord,	Invoc. of Saints.	Ch. 18, 187
Mal. 1. 11,	For from the rising,	The Mass,	Ch. 13, 136
Matt. 5. 25,	Agree with thine adversary,	Purgatory,	Ch. 16, 164
... 6. 12,	And forgive us our debts,	ib.	Ch. 16, 161
... 12. 32,	And whosoever speaketh a word,	ib.	Ch. 16, 165
... 12. 36,	But I say unto you, That,	ib.	Ch. 16, 161
... 16. 18,	Thou art Peter, and upon this rock,	Rule of Faith,	Ch. 2, 39
... 16. 18,	Thou art Peter, and upon this rock,	Papal Supremacy,	Ch. 22, 218
... 16. 19,	Whatsoever thou shalt bind,	ib.	Ch. 22, 221
... 18. 15,	If thy brother shall trespass,	Rule of Faith,	Ch. 2, 41
... 18. 18,	Verily I say unto you,	Penance,	Ch. 6, 79
... 28. 20,	Lo, I am with you alway,	Rule of Faith,	Ch. 2, 41
Mark 6. 13,	And they cast out many devils,	The Seven Sac.,	Ch. 5, 67
... 10. 42,	They which are accounted,	Papal Supremacy,	Ch. 22, 222
Luke 11. 4,	And forgive us our sins,	Purgatory,	Ch. 16, 162
... 15. 10,	Likewise, I say unto you,	Invoc. of Saints,	Ch. 18, 188
... 16. 9,	Make to yourselves friends,	ib.	Ch. 18, 188
... 16. 27,	Then He said, I pray thee,	ib.	Ch. 18, 188
... 22. 14,	And when the hour was come,	Transubstan.,	Ch. 10, 113
... 22. 19,	This is my body,	The Mass,	Ch. 13, 135
... 22. 31,	Simon, Simon, behold Satan,	Papal Supremacy,	Ch. 22, 221
... 24. 30,	And it came to pass, as He sat,	Com. in one kind,	Ch. 15, 152

Books of Scripture.		Commencement of Quotation.	Title of Chap.	Page.
John	6. 51.	I am the living bread,	Transubstan.,	Ch. 10. 110
...	16. 12,	I have yet many things to say,	Rule of Faith,	Ch. 1. 28
...	20. 21,	Then said Jesus to them again,	Penance,	Ch. 6. 77
...	20. 30,	And many other signs,	Rule of Faith,	Ch. 1, 28
...	21. 15,	Lovest thou me?	Papal Supremacy,	Ch. 22, 222
...	21. 25,	The world itself could not contain,	Rule of Faith,	Ch. 1, 29
Acts	2. 42,	And they continued stedfastly,	Com. in one kind,	Ch. 15, 152
...	19. 18,	And many that believed came,	Auric. Confes.,	Ch. 7, 84
...	20. 7,	And upon the first day,	Com. in one kind,	Ch. 15, 152
Rom.	6. 23,	For the wages of sin is death,	Purgatory,	Ch. 16, 161
1 Cor.	3. 13,	Every man's work,	ib.	Ch. 16, 165
...	4. 9,	For we are made a spectacle,	Invoc. of Saints,	Ch. 18, 189
...	10. 17,	We, being many, are one bread,	Com. in one kind,	Ch. 15, 152
...	11. 2,	Now I praise you, brethren,	Rule of Faith,	Ch. 1, 28
...	11. 23,	For I have received of the Lord,	Transubstan.,	Ch. 10, 115
...	11. 29,	For he that eateth and drinketh,	ib.	Ch. 10, 117
...	11. 34,	And the rest will I set in order,	Rule of Faith,	Ch. 1, 28
Ephes.	5. 32.	This is a great mystery,	The Seven Sac.	Ch. 5, 69
2 Thes.	2. 15,	Stand fast, and hold the traditions,	Rule of Faith,	Ch. 1, 29
1 Tim.	3. 15,	But if I tarry long,	ib.	Ch. 2, 42
...	6. 20,	Keep that which is committed,	ib.	Ch. 1, 29
2 Tim.	1. 13,	Hold fast the form of sound words,	ib.	Ch. 1, 29
Heb.	12. 22.	Ye are come unto Mount Sion,	Invoc. of Saints,	Ch 18, 188
James	3. 2,	In many things we offend all,	Purgatory,	Ch. 16, 161
...	5. 14,	Is any sick among you,	The Seven Sac.,	Ch. 5, 68
...	5. 16,	Confess your faults one to another,	Auric. Confes.,	Ch. 7, 84
1 Peter	3. 18,	For Christ also hath once suffered,	Purgatory,	Ch. 16, 167
2 Peter	1. 20,	Knowing this first, that no,	Rule of Faith,	Ch. 4, 58
...	3. 16,	As also in all his epistles,	ib.	Ch. 4, 59
1 John	1. 8,	If we say we have no sin,	Purgatory,	Ch. 16, 161
3 John	13,	I had many things to write,	Rule of Faith,	Ch. 1, 29
Rev.	5. 8.	And when he had taken,	Invoc. of Saints,	Ch. 18, 187
...	6. 10.	How long, O Lord, holy and true,	ib.	Ch. 18. 188
...	22. 8.	And I, John, saw these things,	ib.	Ch. 18, 192

DR. MANNING'S ASSERTION

THAT THE POPE'S INFALLIBILITY WAS NOT AN OPEN QUESTION BEFORE 1870, REFUTED BY ROMISH WITNESSES.

Dr. Manning's Assertion.

Dr. Manning says: "The infallibility of the Pope was likewise never defined (that is, before 1870), but *it was never an open question.*" Again, he says "the doctrine of the infallibility of the Head of the Church was a doctrine of Divine faith before it was defined in 1870." (*The Vatican Decrees*, p. 15, London, 1875.) The Cardinal, by these bold assertions, endeavours to evade the awkward fact that the Church of Rome requires, as a condition of communion, what was not required before 1870; but his attempt is fruitless, and he only "kicks against the pricks."

Manning refuted by Romanists.

We now cite authorities to show that the new dogma, which grew up in the Middle Ages, was denied by eminent Romanists, and was "an open question" before the recent definition.

Alphonsus de Castro was chaplain to Philip of Spain, the husband of Mary, Queen of England. His sentiments towards Protestants were most intolerant. He says: "I believe there is none so shameless a flatterer of the Pope that will grant him that prerogative that he can never err, nor be deceived in expounding the Scriptures, seeing it is well known that divers Popes have been so palpably unlearned that they have been utterly ignorant of their grammar, and therefore how can they

be able to expound the Scriptures?" (*Advers. Hæres*, lib. 1, cap. 2.)

Canon Waterworth, a well-known Romish controversialist, published an exposition of the doctrines of the Romish Church. He says, as to the Pope's *fallibility*, that "many learned divines, *even Adrian VI.*, before he ascended the Papal throne, maintained it." (*The Rule of Catholic Faith*, p. 134, Birmingham, 1833.)

It is notorious that Bossuet and the Gallicans denied the Pope's infallibility, and were in communion with Rome.

We now cite a passage from Cardinal Bellarmine:—

"The second opinion is, that a Pope, even in the character as Pope, may be a heretic and teach heresy, if he defines without a General Council, and that this has in fact happened. Nilus follows and defends this opinion in his book against the Pope's primacy; certain Parisians—as Gerson and Almain in their books on the power of the Church—follow the same opinion; and, moreover, Alphonsus de Castro in his first book against heresies, chapter 2, *and Pope Adrian VI.*, in his questions on confirmation; all of whom vest infallibility in the Church only, and *not in the Pope*." (*De Pontif*, lib. 4, c. 2.)

Æneas Sylvius was an eminent theologian, and Secretary of the Council of Basil. As such, he exhibited great zeal for the superiority of Councils to the Pope. He says: "*The Church is as much superior to the Roman pontiff, as a son is inferior to his mother.* We have already said that the Church is the spouse of Christ; and we know that the Pope is his vicar. But *no one has so appointed his vicar as to subject to him his wife.*" (*Comm. Æneæ Sylvii de gestis Basil Con.*, lib. 1, Basil.)

The new dogma, defined in 1870, gives to the Pope *full* and *supreme* power of jurisdiction over the universal Church. This is in direct opposition to the above passage,* and not only so, but to the Council of Basil,

* Æneas Sylvius became Pope Pius II., and then retracted the above statement.

which, as Bellarmine states, excommunicated the Pope (*De Concil Auctor*, lib. 2, c. 17, Ingoldstat, 1590); and to the decrees of the Council of Constance, which decreed "that every one, be his condition or dignity what it may, even be it the dignity *of the Pope*, is bound to obey it in those things which appertain to faith, and the extirpation of the said schism, and the reformation of the said Church in her head and members." (*Labbe and Cossart's Councils*, p. 22, tom. 12, Lutet, Paris, 1672.) Popes, no doubt, have refused to confirm the above decree, but the fact remains that the theologians and Bishops of Basil maintained the inferiority of the Pope to Councils. How Dr. Manning could assert that this was "*never an open question*" we cannot conceive!!!

But Dr. Manning in his statement is not only opposed to ancient but to modern Romish theologians.

Mr. French, in his discussion with Dr. Cumming, said: "There are some Catholic Divines who have asserted it (the Pope's infallibility). We do not believe it. It is not an article of our faith; *it is rather repugnant to our faith.*" (*Discuss.*, p. 414, London, 1841.)

Dr. Newman, the eminent pervert, writing to Dr. Pusey in 1866, says: "You consider my principle (development) may be the means of *introducing into our Creed*, as portions of the necessary Catholic faith, *the infallibility of the Pope*, and various opinions, pious or profane, as it may be, about our blessed Lady. I hope to remove your anxiety as to these consequences before I bring my observations to an end." (*Letter to Pusey, Intro.*, London, 1866.) Dr. Newman strenuously but vainly opposed the definition.

We now refer to "the Declaration of the Archbishops and Bishops of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland," signed in 1826 by no less than *thirty Prelates!* which contains the following denial:—

"*That it is not an article of the Catholic faith, neither are they thereby required to believe, that the Pope is infallible.*" (*M'Ghee's Laws of the Papacy*, p. 317, 1841.)

YET CARDINAL MANNING SAYS THAT THE POPE'S INFALLIBILITY WAS NEVER AN OPEN QUESTION!!!

The fact is patent to the world, that the Church of Rome has shifted her position, and now requires as a condition of communion what was not imposed even by the Creed of Pope Pius IV.!

(*Extract from No. 2 of twelve tracts on Pope Pius's Creed, by Dr. Blakeney.*)

Printed by WILLIAM BISHOP, Market Street, Edinburgh.

IMPORTANT WORKS ON POPERY,

BY

THE REV. R. P. BLAKENEY, LL.D., D.D.,

Published by THE HOPE TRUST, 31 Moray Place, Edinburgh.

PROTESTANT CATECHISM; OR, POPERY REFUTED AND PROTESTANTISM ESTABLISHED BY THE WORD OF GOD.
One Hundredth Thousand, 72 pages, demy 12mo, price 3d. prepaid
Postage, 1d.; Three Copies, 2½d.

MANUAL OF THE ROMISH CONTROVERSY: Being a Complete Refutation of the Creed of Pius IV. New Edition, with Synopsis, Encyclical Letter, &c.
Eighteenth Thousand, 316 pages, demy 12mo, cloth, price 1s. prepaid.
Postage, 3d.

POPERY IN ITS SOCIAL ASPECT: Being a Complete Exposure of the Immorality and Intolerance of Romanism.
Seventh Thousand, 326 pages, demy 12mo, cloth, price 1s. prepaid.
Postage, 3d.

Also by the Rev. J. A. WYLIE, LL.D.,

Author of "THE HISTORY OF PROTESTANTISM," &c.

WHICH SOVEREIGN—QUEEN VICTORIA OR THE POPE? Complete and Unabridged Edition.
390 pages, crown 8vo, cloth, gilt lettering, price 2s. 6d. prepaid.
Postage, 5½d.

WHICH SOVEREIGN—QUEEN VICTORIA OR THE POPE? Abridged Edition. Edited by Mark Knowles, Esq.
122 pages, demy 16mo, tinted covers, price 3d. prepaid.
Postage, 1d.

THE PAPACY IS THE ANTICHRIST. A Demonstration.
176 pages, demy 16mo, cloth, gilt lettering, price 6d. prepaid.
Postage, 1½d.

IMPORTANT WORKS ON POPERY

To be had from THE HOPE TRUST, 31 Moray Place, Edinburgh.

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY AND SUPREMACY TRIED BY ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, SCRIPTURE, AND REASON. By Arthur Edward Gayer, Esq., Q.C., LL.D. Price 2s. 6d.

SAINT ALPHONSUS LIGUORI; or, Disclosures of the Iniquitous Principles taught by Liguori, and sanctioned by the Church of Rome. By the Rev. Dr. Blakeney. Second Edition. Price 4s. 6d.

FOYE'S ROMISH RITES, OFFICES, AND LEGENDS; or, Authorized Superstitions and Idolatries of the Church of Rome. Literally translated from the Pontifical Mass Book, Breviary, Roman Anglican Ritual, Church Lesson, Hymns, &c. By the Rev. M. W. Foye, M.A. Third Edition. Price 4s. 6d.

THE PAPACY: Its History, Dogmas, Genius, and Prospects. Being the Evangelical Alliance First Prize Essay on Popery. By the Rev. J. A. Wylie, LL.D.

Nearly 600 pages, demy 8vo, cloth. Now offered at the reduced price of 2s. 6d. prepaid.

POPERY IN POLITICS; or, Handbook for the Study and Discussion of Popery. Vols. I. and II. Including Copious and Minute Tables of Contents and Indices.

Vol. I., 494 pages, demy 12mo, cloth.
Vol. II., 578 pages, demy 12mo, cloth.

Price per Vol., 2s. 6d. Post free, 5d. extra.

WILLET'S "SYNOPSIS OF THE PAPACY." Edited by Rev. John Cumming, D.D. Ten Vols. 8vo. Price 25s.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01116 1769

DATE DUE

DEC 0 1 1998			
APR 0 6 2000			
APR 0 9 2004			
APR 4 2007			